arXiv:0901.0852v2 [math.LO] 17 Jan 2010

GOOD FRAMES WITH A WEAK STABILITY

ADI JARDEN AND SAHARON SHELAH

Abstract. Let K be an abstract elementary class of models. Assume that there are less than the maximal number of models in $K_{\lambda^{+n}}$ (namely models in K of power λ^{+n}) for all n. We provide conditions on K_λ, that imply the existence of a model in $K_{\lambda^{+n}}$ for all n. We do this by providing sufficiently strong conditions on K_λ, that they are inherited by a properly chosen subclass of K_{λ^+}.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
1.1. The required knowledge 2
1.2. The assumptions 3
1.3. Notations 3
2. Non-forking frames 10
2.1. non-forking with greater models 18
3. The decomposition and amalgamation method 22
3.1. The a.e.c. $(K^{3,bs}, \preceq_{bs})$ and amalgamations 22
3.2. Decomposition 26
3.3. A disjoint amalgamation 28
4. Uniqueness triples 29
5. Non-forking amalgamation 37
5.1. The axioms of non-forking amalgamation 37
5.2. The relation NF 39
5.3. Weak Uniqueness 42
5.4. Long transitivity 47
6. A relation on K_{λ^+} that is based on the relation NF 50
7. $\prec^+$ and saturated models 54
8. relative saturation 66
9. Non-smoothness implies non-structure 71
10. a good λ^+-frame 74
11. Conclusions 80
12. Comparison to [Sh 600] 81
Acknowledgment 82
References 82

This work is supported by Number 875 on Shelah's list of publications. It is a part of the PHD thesis of the first author with the supervisor of Boaz Tsaban.

1. Introduction

The book classification theory, [Sh:c], of elementary classes, i.e. classes of first order theories, presents properties of theories, which are so called "dividing lines" and investigates them. When such a property is satisfied, the theory is low, i.e. we can prove structure theorems, such as:

1. The fundamental theorem of finitely generated Abelian groups.
2. ArtinWedderburn Theorem on semi-simple rings.
3. If V is a vector space, then it has a basis B, and V is the direct sum of the subspaces $span\{b\}$ where $b \in B$.

(we do not assert that these results follow from the model theoretic analysis, but they merely illustrate the meaning of 'structure'). But when such a property is not satisfied, we have *non-structure*, namely there is a witness that the theory is complicated, and there are no structure theorems. This witness can be the existence of many models in the same power.

There has been much work on classification of elementary classes, and some work on other classes of models.

The main topic in the new book, ([Sh:h]), is *abstract elementary classes* (In short a.e.c.). There are two additional books which deal with a.e.c.s ([Ba:book] and [Gr:book]).

From the viewpoint of the algebraist, model theory of first order theories is somewhat close to universal algebra. But he prefers focusing on the structures, rather than on sentences and formulas. Our context, abstract elementary classes, is closer to universal algebra, as our definitions do not mention sentences or formulas.

As superstability is one of the better dividing lines for first order theories, it is natural to generalize this notion to a.e.c.s. A reasonable generalization is that of the existence of a good λ-frame, (see Definition 2.1 on page 11), introduced in [Sh 600]. In [Sh 600] we assume existence of a good λ-frame and either get a non-structure property (in λ^{++}, at least where $2^\lambda < 2^{\lambda^+} < 2^{\lambda^{++}}$) or derive a good λ^+-frame from it. Our paper generalizes [Sh 600], weakening the assumption of a good λ-frame, or more specifically weakening the basic stability assumption.

1.1. **The required knowledge.**

We assume basic knowledge in set theory (ordinals, cardinals, closed unbounded subsets and stationary subsets). In model theory, we just assume the reader is familiar with notions, every student in algebra knows (theory, model=structure, isomorphism and embedding). Especially we do not assume the reader is familiar with formula and elementary substructure, as here we do not deal with those notions (except in one example). Of course, we do not assume the reader has read any paper in abstract elementary classes, and if the reader prefers to translate a model as a group, he will not lose the main ideas. We sometimes refer to another paper, for the following four tasks:

(1) To convince the reader that an assumption is reasonable, i.e. to prove that we can conclude something from its negation.
(2) To give examples.
(3) To compare it with [Sh 600].
(4) To point out its continuations.

The best way to read this paper is to read it until its end, before reading any reference.

1.2. **The assumptions.** When we write a hypothesis, we assume it until we write another hypothesis, but usually we recall the hypothesis in the beginning the following section. When we write 'but we do not use local character', the reader may wonder why? The answer is that we want to apply theorems we prove here, in papers, in which local character is not assumed (for example [JrSh 940]). For the same reason, in Hypothesis 3.1 we assume weak assumptions.

1.3. **Notations.** We use the letters m, n, k, l for natural numbers or integer numbers, $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, i, j, \varepsilon, \zeta$ for ordinal numbers, δ for a limit ordinal number, κ, λ, μ for cardinal numbers, p, q for types, P for a set of types, K for a class of models, $\mathfrak{k}$,$\mathfrak{s}, U$ for specific uses.

Definition 1.1 (Abstract Elementary Classes)**.**

(1) Let K be a class of models for a fixed vocabulary and let $\preceq=\preceq$ be a 2-place relation on K. The pair $(K, \preceq)$ is an *a.e.c.* if the following axioms are satisfied:
  (a) $K, \preceq$ are closed under isomorphisms. In other words, if $M_1 \in K$, $M_0 \preceq M_1$ and $f : M_1 \to N_1$ is an isomorphism then $N_1 \in K$ and $f[M_0] \preceq N_1$.
  (b) $\preceq$ is a partial order and it is included in the inclusion relation.
  (c) If $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \delta \rangle$ is a continuous $\preceq$-increasing sequence, then
$$M_0 \preceq \bigcup \{M_\alpha : \alpha < \delta\} \in K.$$
  (d) Smoothness: If $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \delta \rangle$ is a continuous $\preceq$-increasing sequence, and for every $\alpha < \delta$, $M_\alpha \preceq N$, then
$$\bigcup \{M_\alpha : \alpha < \delta\} \preceq N.$$
  (e) If $M_0 \subseteq M_1 \subseteq M_2$ and $M_0 \preceq M_2 \wedge M_1 \preceq M_2$, then $M_0 \preceq M_1$.
  (f) There is a Lowenheim Skolem Tarski number, $LST(K, \preceq)$, which is the first cardinal λ, such that for every model $N \in K$ and a subset A of it, there is a model $M \in K$ such that $A \subseteq M \preceq N$ and the cardinality of M is $\leq \lambda + |A|$.

(2) $(K, \preceq)$ is an *a.e.c. in* λ if: The cardinality of every model in K is λ, and it satisfies axioms a,b,d,e of a.e.c. (Definition 1.1.1), and axiom 1.1.1.c for sequences $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \delta \rangle$ with $\delta < \lambda^+$.

Remark 1.2.

1. If K is a class of models for a fixed vocabulary, then $(K, \subseteq)$ satisfies axioms b,d,e of a.e.c. (Definition 1.1.1).
2. Suppose $(K, \preceq)$ is an a.e.c.. If $(K, \subseteq)$ satisfies axiom 1.1.1.c, then $(K, \subseteq)$ is an a.e.c..
3. If $(K, \preceq)$ is an a.e.c. and $K' \subseteq K$ then $(K', \preceq\restriction K')$ satisfies axioms b,d,e of a.e.c. (Definition 1.1.1).

We give some simple examples of a.e.c.s. One can see more examples in [Gr 21].

Example 1.3. Let T be a first order theory. Denote $K =: \{M : M \models T\}$. Define $M \preceq N$ if M is an elementary submodel of N. $(K, \preceq)$ is an a.e.c..

Example 1.4. Let T be a first order theory with Π_2 axioms, namely axioms of the form $\forall x \exists y \varphi(x, y)$ [For example $(\forall x, y)(x + y = y + x)$ is OK, as it is equivalent to the Π_2 axiom $(\forall x, y)\exists z(x + y = y + x)$]. Denote $K =: \{M : M \models T\}$. Then $(K, \subseteq)$ is an a.e.c..

Example 1.5. The class of *locally-finite groups* (the subgroup generated by every finite subset of the group is finite) with the relation $\subseteq$ is an a.e.c..

Example 1.6. Let K be the class of groups. Let $\preceq =: \{(M, N) : M, N$ are groups, and M is a *pure* subgroup of $N\}$ (M is a pure subgroup of N if and only if $N \models (\exists y)ry = m$ implies $M \models (\exists y)ry = m$ for every integer r and every $m \in M$). $(K, \preceq)$ is an a.e.c..

Example 1.7. The class of models that are isomorphic to $(\mathbb{N}, <)$ with the relation $\subseteq$ is *not* an a.e.c., as it does not satisfy axiom 1.1.1.c: $\bigcup\{\{-n, -n+1, -n+2..0, 1, 2...\} : 0 \leq n\}$ is isomorphic to $(\mathbb{Z}, <)$ although $\{-n, -n+1, -n+2..0, 1, 2...\}$ is isomorphic to $(\mathbb{N}, <)$.

But the class of models that are isomorphic to $(\mathbb{N}, 0, <)$ with the relation $\subseteq$ is an a.e.c., (the relation $\subseteq$ in this case is actually the equality, and this a.e.c. has just one model).

Example 1.8. The class of *Banach spaces* with the relation $\subseteq$ is *not* an a.e.c., as it does not satisfy axiom 1.1.1.c.

Example 1.9. The class of *sets* (i.e. models without relations or functions) of cardinality less than κ, where $\aleph_0 \leq \kappa$ and the relation is $\subseteq$, is *not* an a.e.c., as it does not satisfy axiom 1.1.1.c.

The class of sets with the relation $\preceq = \{(M, N) : M \subseteq N$ and $||N - M|| > \kappa\}$ where $\aleph_0 \leq \kappa$, is not an a.e.c., as it does *not* satisfy smoothness (axiom 1.1.1.d).

Definition 1.10. We say $M \prec N$ when $M \preceq N$ and $M \neq N$.

Definition 1.11. $K_\lambda =: \{M \in K : ||M|| = \lambda\}$, $K_{<\lambda} = \{M \in K : ||M|| < \lambda\}$, etc.

By the following proposition we can replace the increasing continuous sequence in axioms c,d in Definition 1.1 by a directed order.

Proposition 1.12. *Let* $(K, \preceq)$ *be an a.e.c.,* I *be a* directed *order and suppose that for* $s, t \in I$ *we have* $M_s \in K$ *and* $s \leq_I t \Rightarrow M_s \preceq M_t$. *Then:*

1. $M_0 \preceq \bigcup\{M_s : s \in I\} \in K$.
2. *If for every* $s \in I$, $M_s \preceq N \in K$, *then* $\bigcup\{M_s : s \in I\} \preceq N$.

Proof. We prove the two items of the proposition simultaneously, by induction on $|I|$. For finite I, there is nothing to prove, so assume I is infinite. There is an increasing continuous sequence of subsets of I, $\langle I_\alpha : \alpha < |I|\rangle$, such that $|I_\alpha| < |I|$. Denote $M_{I_\alpha} := \bigcup\{M_s : s \in I_\alpha\}$ and $M_I := \bigcup\{M_s : s \in I\}$. If $\alpha < \beta < |I|$ then by item (1) of the induction hypothesis, $s \in I_\alpha \Rightarrow M_s \preceq M_{I_\alpha}$. But as $I_\alpha \subseteq I_\beta$, $s \in I_\beta$, so $M_s \preceq M_{I_\beta}$. So by item (2) of the induction hypothesis, $M_{I_\alpha} \preceq M_{I_\beta}$. Hence the sequence $\langle M_{I_\alpha} : \alpha < |I|\rangle$ is increasing. But it is also continuous, as the sequence $\langle I_\alpha : \alpha < |I|\rangle$ is continuous. So by axiom c of Definition 1.1 $M_{I_\alpha} \preceq M_I \in K$. So as $\preceq$ is transitive and $M_s \preceq M_{I_\alpha}$ for $s \in I_\alpha$, we have $M_s \preceq M_I \in K$. Hence we have proved item (1) of the proposition for the cardinality $|I|$. Now we prove item (2) of the proposition for $|I|$. If for every $s \in I$, $M_s \preceq N \in K$, then by item (2) of the induction hypothesis, for $\alpha < |I|$, we have $M_{I_\alpha} \preceq N \in K$, hence we can apply axiom (d) of Definition 1.1 for the increasing continuous sequence $\langle M_{I_\alpha} : \alpha < |I|\rangle$, so $\bigcup\{M_{I_\alpha} : \alpha < |I|\} \preceq N$. But $M_I = \bigcup\{M_{I_\alpha} : \alpha < |I|\}$. ⊣

Definition 1.13. $(K, \preceq)^{up} := (K^{up}, \preceq^{up})$ where we define:

1. K^{up} is the class of models with the vocabulary of K, such that there are a directed order I, and a set of models $\{M_s : s \in I\}$ such that: $M = \bigcup\{M_s : s \in I\}$ and $s \leq_I t \Rightarrow M_s \preceq M_t$.
2. For $M, N \in K^{up}$, $M \preceq^{up} N$ iff there are directed orders I, J and sets of models $\{M_s : s \in I\}$, $\{N_t : t \in J\}$ respectively such that: $M = \bigcup\{M_s : s \in I\}$, $N = \bigcup\{N_t : t \in J\}$, $I \subseteq J$, $s \leq_J t \Rightarrow N_s \preceq N_t$, $s \leq_I t \Rightarrow M_s \preceq M_t \preceq N_t$.

Proposition 1.14. *If*

1. $(K_1, \preceq_1), (K_2, \preceq_2)$ *are a.e.c.s in* λ.
2. $K_1 \subseteq K_2$.
3. $\preceq_2 \restriction K_1$ *is* $\preceq_1$.

Then $K_1^{up} \subseteq K_2^{up}$ *and* $(\preceq_2)^{up} \restriction K_1^{up}$ *is* $(\preceq_1)^{up}$.

Proof. Easy. ⊣

Fact 1.15 (Lemma 1.23 in [Sh 600])**.** *Let* $(K, \preceq)$ *be an a.e.c. in* λ. *Then*

1. $(K, \preceq)^{up}$ *is an a.e.c..*
2. $(K^{up})_\lambda = K$.
3. $\preceq^{up}\restriction K$ *is* $\preceq$.
4. $LST(K, \preceq)^{up} = \lambda$.

Definition 1.16.

1. Let M, N be models in K, f is an injection of M to N. We say that f is a $\preceq$-*embedding* and write $f : M \to N$, or shortly f is an

embedding (if $\preceq$ is clear from the context), when f is an injection with domain M and $Im(f) \preceq N$.

(2) A function $f : B \to C$ is *over* A, if $A \subseteq B \bigcap C$ and $x \in A \Rightarrow f(x) = x$.

Definition 1.17.

(1) $K^3_{K,\preceq} =: \{(M,N,a) : M,N \in K,\ M \preceq N,\ a \in N\}$. When the class $(K,\preceq)$ is clear from the context we omit it writing K^3.
(2) $K^3_\lambda := \{(M,N,a) : M,N \in K_\lambda,\ M \preceq N,\ a \in N\}$.

Definition 1.18.

(1) $E^*_{K,\preceq}$ is the following relation on $K^3_{K,\preceq}$: $(M_0,N_0,a_0)E^*(M_1,N_1,a_1)$ iff $M_1 = M_0$ and for some $N_2 \in K_\lambda$ with $N_1 \preceq N_2$ there is an embedding $f : N_0 \to N_2$ over M_0 with $f(a_0) = a_1$.
(2) $E_{K,\preceq}$ is the closure of $E^*_{K,\preceq}$ under transitivity, i.e. the closure to an equivalence relation.

When $(K,\preceq)$ is clear from the context we omit it writing E^*, E.

Definition 1.19.

(1) We say that $(K_\lambda, \preceq\restriction K_\lambda)$ has *amalgamation* when: For every M_0, M_1, M_2 in K_λ, such that $n < 3 \Rightarrow M_0 \preceq M_n$, there are f_1, f_2, M_3 such that: $f_n : M_n \to M_3$ is an embedding over M_0, i.e. the diagram below commutes. In such a case we say that M_3 is an amalgam of M_1, M_2 over M_0.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
M_1 \arrow[r, "f_1"] & M_3 \\
M_0 \arrow[u, "\mathrm{id}"] \arrow[r, "\mathrm{id}"'] & M_2 \arrow[u, "f_2"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

(2) we say that K_λ has *joint embedding* when: If $M_1, M_2 \in K_\lambda$, then there are f_1, f_2, M_3 such that for $n = 1,2$ $f_n : M_n \to M_3$ is an embedding and $M_3 \in K_\lambda$.
(3) A model M in K_λ is *superlimit* when:
    (a) If $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha \leq \delta\rangle$ is an increasing continuous sequence of models in K_λ, $\delta < \lambda^+$ and $\alpha < \delta \Rightarrow M_\alpha \cong M$, then $M_\delta \cong M$.
    (b) M is $\preceq$-universal.
    (c) M is not $\preceq$-maximal.
(4) $M \in K$ is *$\preceq$-maximal* if there is no $N \in K$ with $M \prec N$.

Proposition 1.20.

(1) For every $M, N_0, N_1 \in K_\lambda$, $a \in N_0 - M$ and $b \in N_1 - M$, $(M,N_0,a)E^*$ (M,N_1,b) iff there is an amalgamation N, f_0, f_1 of N_0, N_1 over M such that $f_0(a) = f_1(b)$.
(2) E^* is a reflexive, symmetric relation.

(3) *If* $(K_\lambda, \preceq\restriction K_\lambda)$ *has amalgamation, then* E^*_λ *is an equivalence relation.*

Proof. Easy. $\dashv$

Definition 1.21.

(1) For every $(M, N, a) \in K^3$ let $tp_{K,\preceq}(a, M, N)$, the *type* of a in N over M, be the equivalence class of (M, N, a) under $E_{K,\preceq}$ When the class $(K, \preceq)$ is clear from the context we omit it, writing $tp(a, M, N)$ (In other texts, it is called '$ga - tp(a/M, N)$').

(2) For every $M \in K$, $S(M) := \{tp(a, M, N) : (M, N, a) \in K^3\}$.

(3) If $p = tp(a, M_1, N)$ and $M_0 \preceq M_1$, then we define $p \restriction M_0 = tp(a, M_0, N)$,

Remark 1.22. By the definitions of E, E^* it is easy to check that $p \restriction M_0$ does not depend on the representative of p.

Proposition 1.23. *For every* $M, N, N^+ \in K$ *and* $a \in N - M$ *with* $M \bigcup \{a\} \subseteq N \preceq N^+$, $tp(a, M, N) = tp(a, M, N^+)$.

Proof. Easy. $\dashv$

Definition 1.24. Suppose $M \preceq N$.

(1) For $p \in S(M)$, we say that N *realizes* p if for some $a \in N$ $p = tp(a, M, N)$.

(2) For $P \subseteq S(M)$, we say that N *realizes* P if N realizes every type in P.

(3) For $p \in S(M)$ and $a \in N - M$, we say that a *realizes* p, when $p = tp(a, M, N)$.

Proposition 1.25. *Let* $M, M_0 \in K_\lambda$, $M_0 \preceq M$. *Suppose* $(K_\lambda, \preceq\restriction K_\lambda)$ *has amalgamation and* $LST(K, \preceq) \leq \lambda$. *Let* P *be a set of types over* M_0, $|P| \leq \lambda$. *Then there is a model* N *in* K_λ *such that* $M \preceq N$ *and* N *realizes* P.

Proof. Easy. $\dashv$

Definition 1.26. Let $M, N \in K$. M is said to be *full* over N when M satisfies $S(N)$. M is said to be *saturated* in λ^+ over λ, when for every model $N \in K_\lambda$, if $N \preceq M$ then M is full over N.

Remark 1.27. This is the reasonable sense of saturated model we can use in our context, as we do not want to assume anything about $K_{<\lambda}$, especially not stability and not amalgamation, (so a saturated model in λ^+ over λ may not be full over a model $N \in K_{<\lambda}$, $N \preceq M$), see the following example from [BKS].

Example 1.28. Let τ contain infinitely many unary predicates P_n and one binary predicate E. Define a first order theory T such that $P_{n+1}(x) \Rightarrow P_n(x)$, E is an equivalence relation with two classes, which are each represented be exactly one point in $P_n - P_{n+1}$ for each n. Now let K be the class of models in T, that omit the type of two inequivalent points that satisfy all the P_n. Then a model $M \in K$ is determined up to isomorphism by $\mu(M) := |\{x \in M : (\forall n)P_n(x)\}|$. So K is categorical in every uncountable powers, but has $\aleph_0$ countable models (none of them is finite). Now let $\preceq$ be the relation of being submodel. Then $(K, \preceq)$ is an a.e.c. with $L.S.T.(K, \preceq) = \aleph_0$. Let $M_0, M_1, M_2 \in K$ be such that $\mu(M) = 0, \mu(M_1) = \mu(M_2) = 1$ and M_1, M_2 are not isomorphic over M_0. Then there is no amalgamation of M_1, M_2 over M_0. Now if $\lambda > \aleph_0$ then every model $M \in K_{\lambda^+}$ is saturated (over λ). But it is not saturated over $\aleph_0$, since it can not realize $tp(a_1, M_0, M_1), tp(a_2, M_0, M_2)$, (where a_n is the unique element of $M_n - M_0$ of course).

Definition 1.29. Let M be a model in K_{λ^+}. M is said to be *homogenous* in λ^+ over λ if for every $N_1, N_2 \in K_\lambda$ with $N_1 \preceq M \wedge N_1 \preceq N_2$, there is a $\preceq$-embedding $f : N_2 \to M$ over N_1.

Definition 1.30. A *representation* of a model M is an $\preceq$-increasing continuous sequence $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < ||M|| \rangle$ of models with union M, such that $||M_\alpha|| < ||M||$ for each α and if $||M|| = \lambda^+$ then $||M_\alpha|| = \lambda$ for each α.

The following proposition is a version of Fodor's lemma (there is no mathematical reason to choose this version, but we think that it is comfortable).

Proposition 1.31. *There are no $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha \in \lambda^+ \rangle$, $\langle N_\alpha : \alpha \in \lambda^+ \rangle$, $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha \in \lambda^+ \rangle, S$ such that the following conditions are satisfied:*

1. *The sequences $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha \in \lambda^+ \rangle$, $\langle N_\alpha : \alpha \in \lambda^+ \rangle$ are $\preceq$-increasing continuous sequences of models in K_λ.*
2. *For every $\alpha < \lambda^+$ $f_\alpha : M_\alpha \to N_\alpha$ is a $\preceq$-embedding.*
3. *$\langle f_\alpha : \alpha \in \lambda^+ \rangle$ is an increasing continuous sequence.*
4. *S is a stationary subset of λ^+.*
5. *For every $\alpha \in S$, there is $a \in M_{\alpha+1} - M_\alpha$ $M_{\lambda^+} - M_\alpha$) such that $f_{\alpha+1}(a) \in N_\alpha$.*

Proof. Suppose there are such sequences. Denote $M = \bigcup \{f_\alpha[M_\alpha] : \alpha \in \lambda^+\}$. By clauses 4,5 $||M|| = K_{\lambda^+}$. $\langle f_\alpha[M_\alpha] : \alpha \in \lambda^+ \rangle$, $\langle N_\alpha \bigcap M : \alpha \in \lambda^+ \rangle$ are representations of M. So they are equal on a club of λ^+. Hence there is $\alpha \in S$ such that $f_\alpha[M_\alpha] = N_\alpha \bigcap M$. Hence $f_\alpha[M_\alpha] \subseteq N_\alpha \bigcap f_{\alpha+1}[M_{\alpha+1}] \subseteq N_\alpha \bigcap M = f_\alpha[M_\alpha]$ and so this is an equivalences chain. Especially $f_{\alpha+1}[M_{\alpha+1}] \bigcap N_\alpha = f_\alpha[M_\alpha]$, in contradiction to condition 5. $\dashv$

Proposition 1.32 (saturation = model homogeneity)**.** *Let $(K, \preceq)$ be an a.e.c. such that K_λ has amalgamation, and $LST(K, \preceq) \leq \lambda$. Let M be a model in K_{λ^+}. Then M is saturated in λ^+ over λ iff M is a homogenous model in λ^+ over λ.*

Proof. One direction is trivial, so let us prove the other direction. Suppose M_1^* is saturated in λ^+ over λ, $N_0, N_1 \subseteq K_\lambda$, $N_0 \preceq N_1$, $N_0 \preceq M_1^*$ and there is no embedding of N_1 to M_1^* over N_0. Construct by induction on $\alpha \in \lambda^+$ a triple $(N_{0,\alpha}, N_{1,\alpha}, f_\alpha)$ such that:

(1) For $n < 2$ $\langle N_{n,\alpha} : \alpha \in \lambda^+ \rangle$ is a $\preceq$-increasing continuous sequence of models in K_λ.
(2) $N_{0,0} = N_0,\ N_{1,0} = N_1,\ f_0 = id \restriction N_0$.
(3) For $\alpha \in \lambda^+,\ N_{0,\alpha} \preceq M_1^*$.
(4) $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha \in \lambda^+ \rangle$ is an increasing continuous sequence.
(5) $f_\alpha : N_{0,\alpha} \to N_{1,\alpha}$ is an embedding.
(6) For every $\alpha \in \lambda^+$ there is $a \in N_{0,\alpha+1} - N_{0,\alpha}$ such that $f_{\alpha+1}(a) \in N_{1,\alpha}$.

Why can we carry out the construction?
for $\alpha = 0$ see 2. For α limit, take unions. Suppose we have chosen $N_{0,\alpha}, N_{1,\alpha}, f_\alpha$, how will we choose $N_{0,\alpha+1},\ N_{1,\alpha+1},\ f_{\alpha+1}$? $f_\alpha[N_{0,\alpha}] \neq N_{1,\alpha}$ (otherwise $f_\alpha^{-1} \restriction N_1$ is an embedding of N_1 to M_1^* over N_0, in contradiction to our assumption). Hence there is $c \in N_{1,\alpha} - f_\alpha[N_{0,\alpha}]$. As M_1^* is saturated in λ^+ over λ, there is $a \in M_1^*$ such that $tp(a, N_{0,\alpha}, M_1^*) = f_\alpha^{-1}(tp(c, f_\alpha[N_{0,\alpha}], N_{1,\alpha})$. Now $LST(K, \preceq) \leq \lambda$ so there is $N_{0,\alpha+1} \in K_\lambda$, such that $N_{0,\alpha} \bigcup \{a\} \subseteq N_{0,\alpha+1} \preceq M_1^*$. So by axiom e of a.e.c. $N_{0,\alpha} \preceq N_{0,\alpha+1}$. Hence $f_\alpha(tp(a, N_{0,\alpha}, N_{0,\alpha+1})) = tp(c, f_\alpha[N_{0,\alpha}], N_{1,\alpha})$. By the definition of type and having amalgamation, for some model $N_{1,\alpha+1}$ and an embedding $f_{1,\alpha+1}$ the following hold: $N_{1,\alpha} \preceq N_{1,\alpha+1},\ f_{1,\alpha+1}(a) = c$ and $f_\alpha \subseteq f_{\alpha+1} : N_{0,\alpha+1} \to N_{1,\alpha+1}$. Hence we can carry out the construction.
Now the conditions on the existence of the sequences $\langle N_{0,\alpha} : \alpha \in \lambda^+ \rangle, \langle N_{1,\alpha} : \alpha \in \lambda^+ \rangle, \langle f_\alpha : \alpha \in \lambda^+ \rangle$ contradict Proposition 1.31 (requirement 5 in Proposition 1.31 is satisfied by requirement 6 in the construction here). $\dashv$

Now we prove the uniqueness of the saturated model, although we do not know its existence.

Theorem 1.33 (the uniqueness of the saturated model). *Suppose $(K_\lambda, \preceq \restriction K_\lambda)$ has the amalgamation property and $LST(K, \preceq) \leq \lambda$.*

(1) Let $N \in K_\lambda$ and for $n = 1, 2$ $N \preceq M_n$ and M_n is saturated in λ^+ over λ. Then $M_1,\ M_2$ are isomorphic over N.
(2) If $M_1,\ M_2$ are saturated in λ^+ over λ and $(K_\lambda, \preceq \restriction K_\lambda)$ has the joint embedding property then $M_1,\ M_2$ are isomorphic.

Proof. (1) We use the hence and forth method. For $n = 1, 2$ Let $\langle a_{n,\alpha} : \alpha \in \lambda^+ \rangle$ be an enumeration of M_n without repetitions. We choose by induction on $\alpha \in \lambda^+$ a triple $(N_{1,\alpha}, N_{2,\alpha}, f_\alpha)$ such that:

(a) $N_{n,0} = N,\ f_0 = id$.
(b) $N_{n,\alpha} \preceq M_n$.
(c) The sequence $\langle N_{n,\alpha} : \alpha \in \lambda^+ \rangle$ is an increasing continuous sequence of models in K_λ.
(d) $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha \in \lambda^+ \rangle$ is increasing and continuous.
(e) $f_\alpha : N_{1,\alpha} \to N_{2,\alpha}$ is an embedding.
(f) $a_{n,\alpha} \in N_{n,2\alpha+n}$.

Why can we carry out the construction?
For $\alpha = 0$ see a. Let α be a limit ordinal. For $n = 1, 2$ Define $N_{n,\alpha} = \bigcup \{N_{n,\beta} : \beta < \alpha\},\ f_\alpha = \bigcup \{f_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$. By axiom c of a.e.c. (i.e. the closure

under increasing continuous sequences) for $n = 1, 2$ $\beta < \alpha \Rightarrow N_{n,\beta} \preceq N_{n,\alpha}$ and by axiom 1.1.1.d (smoothness) $N_{n,\alpha} \preceq M_n$. So there is no problem in the limit case. Suppose we have defined $N_{1,\alpha},\ N_{2,\alpha},\ f_\alpha$. Suppose $\alpha = 2\beta$. As $LST(K, \preceq) \leq \lambda$, there is a model $N_{1,\alpha+1} \in K_\lambda$ such that $N_{1,\alpha} \bigcup \{a_{1,\beta}\} \subseteq N_{1,\alpha+1} \preceq M_1$. By the induction hypothesis (b) $N_{1,\alpha} \preceq M_1$. Now by axiom 1.1.1.c (closure under increasing continuous sequences) $N_{1,\alpha} \preceq N_{1,\alpha+1}$. Let f^+_α be an injection with domain $N_{1,\alpha+1}$ such that $f_\alpha \subseteq f_{1,\alpha+1}$. Actually it is an isomorphism of its domain to its range. The relation $\preceq$ is closed under isomorphisms, so $N_{2,\alpha} = f_\alpha[N_{1,\alpha}] \preceq f^+_\alpha[N_{1,\alpha+1}]$. M_2 is saturated in λ^+ over λ and so by Lemma 1.32 it is model homogenous in λ^+ over λ. So there is an embedding $g : f^+_\alpha[N_{1,\alpha+1}] \to M_2$ over $N_{2,\alpha}$. Define $f_{\alpha+1} =: g \circ f^+_\alpha,\ N_{2,\alpha+1} =: f_{\alpha+1}[N_{1,\alpha+1}]$. $f_\alpha \subseteq f_{\alpha+1}$ and so (d) is satisfied. Requirement a is not relevant for the successor case. (b) is satisfied for n=1 by the definition of $N_{n,\alpha+1}$ and for n=2 as g is $\preceq -$embedding. (c) is satisfied for n=1 by the construction and for n=2 as $\preceq$ respects isomorphisms. (e) is satisfied by the definition of $f_{\alpha+1}$. (f) is relevant only for n=1. Hence we can carry out the construction in the $\alpha + 1$ step for α even. The case α is an odd number is symmetric, so we have to change a, b. Hence we can carry out the construction.

Now by (b),(f) $\bigcup\{N_{n,\alpha} : \alpha \in \lambda^+\} = M_n$. Define $f = \bigcup\{f_\alpha : \alpha \in \lambda^+\}$. By (e) $f : M_1 \to M_2$ is an isomorphism. By (a),(d) this isomorphism is over N.

(2) For $n = 1, 2$ As $LST(K, \preceq) \leq \lambda$ there is $N_n \preceq M_n$ in K_λ. K_λ has the joint embedding property and so there is a model N and embeddings $f_n : N_n \to N$. Let f^+_n an injection with domain M_n such that $f_n \subseteq f^+_n$. By Lemma 1.32 for $n = 1, 2$ there is an embedding $g_N : N \to f^+_n[M_n]$ over $f_n[N_n]$. Now $f = g_1 \circ g_2^{-1}$ is an isomorphism and so there is an injection g^+ with domain $f^+_2[M_2]$ such that $g \subseteq g^+$. By the definition of g_2, $g_2[N] \preceq f^+_2[M_2]$ and so as $\preceq$ respects isomorphisms, $g_1[N] = g[g_2[N]] \preceq g^+[f_2[M_2]]$. By item a $f^+_1[M_1],\ g^+[f^+_2[M_2]]$ are isomorphic over $g_1[N]$. Hence M_1, M_2 are isomorphic. ⊣

2. Non-forking frames

The plan. Suppose we know something about K_λ, especially that there is no $\preceq$-maximal model. Can we say something about $K_{\lambda^{+n}}$? At least we want to prove that $K_{\lambda^{+n}} \neq \emptyset$. It is easy to prove that $K_{\lambda^+} \neq \emptyset$ [How? We choose M_α by induction on $\alpha < \lambda^+$ such that $M_\alpha \prec M_{\alpha+1}$ and if α is limit we define $M_\alpha := \bigcup\{M_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$ (by axiom 1.1.1.c $M_\alpha \in K$). In the end $M_{\lambda^+} \in K_{\lambda^+}$]. What about $K_{\lambda^{+2}}$? The main topic in this paper is semi-good frames. If there is a semi-good λ-frame, then by Proposition 3.4.2 there is no $\preceq$-maximal model in K_{λ^+}. So $K_{\lambda^{++}} \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, Theorem 11.1.1 says that if $\mathfrak{s}$ is a semi-good λ-frame with some additional assumptions and λ satisfies specific set-theoretic assumptions, then there is a good λ^+-frame $\mathfrak{s}^+ = (K^+, \preceq^+, S^{bs,+}, \overset{+}{\bigcup})$, such that $K^+ \subseteq K$ and the relation $\preceq^+ \restriction K^+$ is included in the relation $\preceq\restriction K^+$. So $K_{\lambda^{+3}} \neq \emptyset$ and so on. Thus we prove $K_{\lambda^{+n}} \neq \emptyset$ by induction on $n < \omega$, (assuming reasonable assumptions).

Definition 2.1 is an axiomatization of the non-forking relation in superstable elementary class. If we subtract axiom 2.1.3.c., we get the basic properties of the non-forking relation in $(K_\lambda, \preceq\restriction K_\lambda)$ where $(K, \preceq)$ is stable in λ.

Sometimes we do not find a natural independence relation on all the types. So first we extend the notion of an a.e.c. in λ by adding a new function S^{bs} which assigns a collection of basic types to each model in K_λ, and then we add an independence relation $\bigcup$ on basic types.

It is reasonable to assume *categoricity* in some cardinality λ for some reasons:

1. In Example 2.7 K is categorical in λ.
2. If K is not categorical in any cardinality, then we know $\{\lambda : K$ is categorical in $\lambda\}$, it is the empty set.
3. If there is a superlimit model in K_λ, then we can reduce $(K_\lambda, \preceq\restriction K_\lambda)$ to the models which are isomorphic to it, and therefore obtain categoricity in λ (see section 1 in [Sh 600]). However this case requires stability.

We do not assume *amalgamation*, but we assume amalgamation in $(K_\lambda, \preceq\restriction K_\lambda)$. This is a reasonable assumption because it is proved in [Sh 88r] that if an a.e.c. is categorical in λ and amalgamation fails in λ then under plausible set theoretic assumptions there are 2^{λ^+} models in K_{λ^+}.

Definition 2.1. $\mathfrak{s} = (K, \preceq, S^{bs}, \bigcup)$ is a *good λ-frame* if:
(1)

(a) $(K, \preceq)$ is an a.e.c..
(b) $LST(K, \preceq) \leq \lambda$.
(c) $(K_\lambda, \preceq\restriction K_\lambda)$ has joint embedding.
(d) $(K_\lambda, \preceq\restriction K_\lambda)$ has amalgamation.
(e) There is no $\preceq$-maximal model in K_λ.

(2) S^{bs} is a function with domain K_λ, which satisfies the following axioms:

(a) $S^{bs}(M) \subseteq S^{na}(M) =: \{tp(a, M, N) : M \prec N \in K_\lambda,\ a \in N - M\}$.
(b) It respects isomorphisms.
(c) Density of the basic types: If $M, N \in K_\lambda$ and $M \prec N$, then there is $a \in N - M$ such that $tp(a, M, N) \in S^{bs}(M)$.
(d) Basic stability: For every $M \in K_\lambda$, the cardinality of $S^{bs}(M)$ is $\leq \lambda$.

(3) the relation $\bigcup$ satisfies the following axioms:

(a) $\bigcup$ is a subset of $\{(M_0, M_1, a, M_3) : M_0, M_1, M_3 \in K,\ ||M_0|| = ||M_1|| = \lambda,\ M_0 \preceq M_1 \preceq M_3,\ a \in M_3 - M_1 \textit{ and } n < 2 \Rightarrow tp(a, M_n, M_3) \in S^{bs}(M_n)\}$.

(b) Monotonicity: If $M_0 \preceq M_0^* \preceq M_1^* \preceq M_1 \preceq M_3 \preceq M_3^*$, $M_1^* \bigcup \{a\} \subseteq M_3^{**} \preceq M_3^*$, then $\bigcup\!\!\!\!|\,(M_0, M_1, a, M_3) \Rightarrow \bigcup\!\!\!\!|\,(M_0^*, M_1^*, a, M_3^{**})$. See Remark 2.2.

(c) Local character: For every limit ordinal $\delta < \lambda^+$ if $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha \leq \delta \rangle$ is an increasing continuous sequence of models in K_λ, and $tp(a, M_\delta, M_{\delta+1}) \in S^{bs}(M_\delta)$, then there is $\alpha < \delta$ such that $tp(a, M_\delta, M_{\delta+1})$ does not fork over M_α.

(d) Uniqueness of the non-forking extension: If $p, q \in S^{bs}(N)$ do not fork over M, and $p \restriction M = q \restriction M$, then $p = q$.

(e) Symmetry: If $M_0 \preceq M_1 \preceq M_3$, $a_1 \in M_1$, $tp(a_1, M_0, M_3) \in S^{bs}(M_0)$, and $tp(a_2, M_1, M_3)$ does not fork over M_0, *then* there are M_2, M_3^* such that $a_2 \in M_2$, $M_0 \preceq M_2 \preceq M_3^*$, $M_3 \preceq M_3^*$, and $tp(a_1, M_2, M_3^*)$ does not fork over M_0.

(f) Existence of non-forking extension: If $p \in S^{bs}(M)$ and $M \prec N$, then there is a type $q \in S^{bs}(N)$ such that q does not fork over M and $q \restriction M = p$.

(g) Continuity: Let $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha \leq \delta \rangle$ be an increasing continuous sequence. Let $p \in S(M_\delta)$. If for every $\alpha \in \delta$, $p \restriction M_\alpha$ does not fork over M_0, then $p \in S^{bs}(M_\delta)$ and does not fork over M_0.

Remark 2.2. If $\bigcup\!\!\!\!|\,(M_0, M_1, a, M_3)$ and $tp(b, M_1, M_3^{**}) = tp(a, M_1, M_3)$ then by Definition 2.1.3.b (the monotonicity axiom) $\bigcup\!\!\!\!|\,(M_0, M_1, a, M_3)$. Therefore we can say "$p$ does not fork over M_0" instead of $\bigcup\!\!\!\!|\,(M_0, M_1, a, M_3)$.

While in [Sh 600] we study good frames, so basic stability is assumed, here we assume basic *weak* stability so the following definition is central:

Definition 2.3. $\mathfrak{s} = ((K^{\mathfrak{s}}, \preceq^{\mathfrak{s}}, S^{bs,\mathfrak{s}}, \overset{\mathfrak{s}}{\bigcup\!\!\!\!|}\,) = (K, \preceq, S^{bs}, \bigcup\!\!\!\!|\,)$ is a *semi*-good λ-frame, if $\mathfrak{s}$ satisfies the axioms of a good λ-frame except that instead of assuming basic stability, we assume that $\mathfrak{s}$ has basic weak stability, namely for every $M \in K_\lambda$ $S^{bs}(M)$ has cardinality at most λ^+.

$\mathfrak{s}$ is said to be a *semi-good frame* if it is a semi-good λ-frame for some λ.

Remark 2.4. If for each $M \in K_\lambda$ $S^{bs}(M) = \{tp(a, M, N) : M \prec N, a \in N - M\}$ then the continuity axiom is an easy consequence of the local character.

Can we define in our context independence, orthogonality and more things like in superstable theories? The answer is: See [Sh 705] (mainly sections 5,6) and [JrSi 3].

Now we give examples of good frames and examples of semi-good frames.

Example 2.5. Let T be a superstable first order theory and let λ be a cardinal $\geq |T| + \aleph_0$ such that T is stable in λ. Let $K_{T,\lambda}$ be the class of models of T of cardinality at least λ. Let $\preceq$ denote the relation of being an elementary submodel. Let $S^{bs}(M)$ be the set of regular types over M. Let $\bigcup\!\!\!\!|$ be as usual. Then by Claim 3.1 on page 52 in [Sh 600] (or see [Sh 91]) $(K_{T,\lambda}, \preceq, S^{bs}, \bigcup\!\!\!\!|\,)$ is a good λ-frame.

Example 2.6. The same as Example 2.5 but the basic types are the non-algebraic types (see [HS 89]).

Example 2.7 (the main example)**.** An example of a semi-good λ-frame which appears in section 3 of [Sh 600] and is based on [Sh 88r]: Let $(K, \preceq)$ be an a.e.c. with a countable vocabulary, $LST(K, \preceq) = \aleph_0$, $(K, \preceq)$ is $PC_{\aleph_0}$ (i.e. K is the class of reduced models to a smaller language, of some countable elementary class, which omit a countable set of types, and the relation $\preceq$ is defined similarly), it has an intermediate number of non-isomorphic models of cardinality $\aleph_1$ and $2^{\aleph_0} < 2^{\aleph_1}$. Then we can derive a semi-good $\aleph_0$-frame from it.

How? For each $M \in K_{\aleph_0}$ define $K_M = \{N \in K : N \equiv_{L_{\infty,\omega}} M\}$, $\preceq_M = \{(N_1, N_2) : N_1, N_2 \in K_M,\ N_1 \preceq N_2,\ \textit{and}\ N_1 \preceq_{L_{\infty,\omega}} N_2\}$. There is a model $M \in K_{\aleph_0}$ such that $(K_M)_{\aleph_1} \neq \emptyset$. Fix such an M. For every $N \in K_M$ with $||N|| = \aleph_0$ define $S^{bs}(N) = \{tp(a, N, N^*) : N \prec_M N^* \in K_M,\ a \in N^* - N\}$. Define $\bigcup := \{(M_0, M_1, a, M_2) : M_0, M_1, M_2 \in K_M,\ ||M_0|| = ||M_1|| = \aleph_0,\ M_0 \preceq_M M_1 \prec_M M_2$ and $tp(a, M_1, M_2)$ is definable over some finite subset A of M_0 in the following sense: For every type $q \in S^{bs}(M_1)$ if '$q \restriction A = tp(a, A, M_2)$' [more precisely for some $b, M_2^*, M_3, f,\ M_1 \preceq M_2^*$, $tp(b, M_1, M_2^*) = q$ $M_2 \preceq M_3$ and f is an isomorphism of M_2^* to M_3 over A with $f(b) = a$] then $q = tp(a, M_1, M_2)$. By the proof of Theorem 3.4 on page 54 in [Sh 600] $\mathfrak{s} := (K_M, \preceq_M, S^{bs}, \bigcup)$ is a semi-good $\aleph_0$-frame [Why? We assumed here assumptions $(\alpha), (\beta), (\gamma)$ of Theorem 3.4. So by Theorem 3.4.1 for some $M \in K_{\aleph_0}$ we have $(\delta^-), (\varepsilon)$ too. So if (δ) (namely stability) holds then by Theorem 3.4.2 $\mathfrak{s}$ is a good $\aleph_0$-frame. Here we have (δ^-) (namely weak stability) only. In the beginning of the proof of item 2 (on page 56) it is written 'we assume (δ^-) instead of (δ)'. By the continuation of the proof, we see that $\mathfrak{s}$ is a semi-good $\aleph_0$-frame]

Definition 2.8. Let $p_0 \in S(M_0), p_1 \in S(M_1)$. We say that p_0, p_1 *conjugate* if for some $a_0, M_0^+, a_1, M_1^+, f$ the following hold:

(1) For $n = 0, 1$, $tp(a_n, M_n, M_n^+) = p_n$.
(2) $f : M_0^+ \to M_1^+$ is an isomorphism.
(3) $f \restriction M_0 : M_0 \to M_1$ is an isomorphism.
(4) $f(a_0) = a_1$.

Proposition 2.9. *Let $p_0 \in S(M_0), p_1 \in S(M_1)$ and assume that p_0, p_1 conjugate.*

(1) If for $n = 1, 2$, $tp(a_n, M_n, M_n^+) = p_n$ and there is an embedding $f : M_0^+ \to M_1^+$ such that $f \restriction M_0 : M_0 \to M_1$ is an isomorphism and $f(a_0) = a_1$, then the types p_0, p_1 conjugate.
(2) Suppose that $a_0, M_0^+, a_1, M_1^+, f$ are as in Definition 2.8, i.e. they witness that p_0, p_1 conjugate. If $tp(a_1^*, M_1, M_1^*) = tp(a_1, M_1, M_1^+)$ then for some M_1^{**} and f^* such that:
  (a) $M_1^* \preceq M_1^{**}$.
  (b) $f^* : M_0^+ \to M_1^{**}$ is an embedding.

   (c) $a_0, M_0^+, a_1^*, f^*[M_0^+], f^*$ *witness that* p_0, p_1 *conjugate.*

(3) Assume that (p_0, p_1 *conjugate and) the types* p_1, p_2 *conjugate. Then* p_0, p_2 *conjugate.*

Proof.

(1) Substitute $f[M_0^+]$ instead of M_1^+ in Definition 2.8.

(2) Since $tp(a_1^*, M_1, M_1^*) = tp(a_1, M_1, M_1^+)$, there is an amalgamation $(id_{M_1^*}, g, M_1^{**})$ of M_1^*, M_1^+ over M_1 such that $g(a_1) = a_1^*$. Now define $f^* := g \circ f$. So $f^*(a_0) = g(f(a_0)) = g(a_1) = a_1^*$.

(3) Suppose that $a_1^*, M_1^*, a_2, M_2^*, g$ witness that p_1, p_2 conjugate. Since the types p_0, p_1 conjugate, there are witnesses for this. So by Proposition 2.9.2 for some a_0, M_0^{**}, f^* the following hold:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & M_1^{**} \arrow[r, "g^+"] & M_2^+ \\
M_0^+ \arrow[ur, "f^*"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_1^* \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "g"] & M_2^* \arrow[u, "id"] \\
M_0 \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "f^* \restriction M_0"] & M_1 \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "g \restriction M_1"] & M_2 \arrow[u, "id"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

   (a) $M_1^* \preceq M_1^{**}$.
   (b) $f^* : M_0^+ \to M_1^{**}$ is an embedding.
   (c) $a_0, M_0^+, a_1^*, f^*[M_0^+], f^*$ witness that p_0, p_1 conjugate.

Since $(K_\lambda, \preceq \restriction K_\lambda)$ has amalgamation, for some g^+, M_2^+ the following hold:

   (a) $g^+ : M_1^{**} \to M_2^+$ is an embedding.
   (b) $M_2^* \preceq M_2^+$.
   (c) $g^+ \restriction M_1^* = g$.

Now define $f := g^+ \circ f^*$. So $a_0, M_0^+, a_2, f[M_0^+], f$ witness that the types p_0, p_2 conjugate. Why? We verify the conditions in Definition 2.8:

(1) $tp(a_0, M_0, M_0^+) = p_0$ because $a_0, M_0^+, a_1^*, f^*[M_0^+], f^*$ witness that p_0, p_1 conjugate. $tp(a_2, M_2, M_2^+) = p_2$ because $a_1^*, M_1^*, a_2, M_2^*, g$ witness that p_1, p_2 conjugate.

(2) $f : M_0^+ \to f^*[M_0^+]$ is an isomorphism.

(3) $f \restriction M_0 : M_0 \to M_2$ is or course an embedding, but why is it onto? Take $z \in M_2$. Since $g \restriction M_1$ is an isomorphism (as $a_1^*, M_1^*, a_2, M_2^*, g$ witness that p_1, p_2 conjugate), there is $y \in M_1$ such that $g(y) = z$. Since $f^* \restriction M_0$ is an isomorphism (as $a_0, M_0^+, a_1^*, f^*[M_0^+], f^*$ witness that p_0, p_1 conjugate), there is $x \in M_0$ such that $g(x) = z$. Therefore $g^+(f^*(x)) = g(f^*(x)) = g(y) = z$.

(4) $f(a_0) = g^+(f^*(a_0)) = g^+(a_1^*) = a_2$.

$\dashv$

Definition 2.10. Let $p = tp(a, M, N)$. Let f be a bijection with domain M. Define $f(p) = tp(f(a), f[M], f^+[N])$, where f^+ is an extension of f (and the relations and functions on $f^+[N]$ are defined such that $f^+ : N \to f^+[N]$ is an isomorphism).

Proposition 2.11. *The definition of $f(p)$ in Definition 2.10 does not depend on the representative $(M, N, a) \in p$.*

Proof. By Proposition 2.9.2. $\dashv$

Definition 2.12. Let $\mathfrak{s}$ be a semi-good λ-frame. We say that $\mathfrak{s}$ *has conjugation* when: K_λ is categorical and if $M_1, M_2 \in K_\lambda$, $M_1 \preceq M_2$ and $p_2 \in S^{bs}(M_2)$ is the non-forking extension of $p_1 \in S^{bs}(M_1)$, then the types p_1, p_2 conjugate.

Proposition 2.13. *The semi-good frame in Example 2.7 has conjugation.*

Proof. Assume that $||M_0|| = ||M_1|| = \aleph_0$, $M_0 \prec_M M_1$ and $p \in S^{bs}(M_1)$ is definable over some finite subset A of M_0. We have to prove that the types $p, p_0 := p \restriction M_0$ conjugate. Since $M_0 \prec_{L_{\infty,\omega}} M_1$, there is an isomorphism $f : M_0 \to M_1$ over A. So $f(p)$ does not fork over $f[M_0]$. But p does not fork over M_0 too. $p \restriction A = (p \restriction M_0) \restriction A = p_0 \restriction A = f(p_0) \restriction A$. Since $f(p_0), p$ are definable over A, $f(p_0) = p$. $\dashv$

Proposition 2.14 (versions of extension)**.** *If for $n < 3$ $M_n \in K_\lambda$, $M_0 \preceq M_n$, and $tp(a, M_1, M_0) \in S^{bs}(M_0)$ then:*

- *(1) There are M_3, f such that:*
  - *(a) $M_2 \preceq M_3$.*
  - *(b) $f : M_1 \to M_3$ is an embedding over M_0.*
  - *(c) $tp(f(a), M_2, M_3)$ does not fork over M_0.*
- *(2) There are M_3, f such that:*
  - *(a) $M_1 \preceq M_3$.*
  - *(b) $f : M_2 \to M_3$ is an embedding over M_0.*
  - *(c) $tp(a, f[M_2], M_3)$ does not fork over M_0.*

Proof. Easily by Definition 2.1.2. $\dashv$

Proposition 2.15 (The transitivity proposition)**.** *Suppose $\mathfrak{s}$ is a semi-good λ-frame. Then: If $M_0 \preceq M_1 \preceq M_2$, $p \in S^{bs}(M_2)$ does not fork over M_1 and $p \restriction M_1$ does not fork over M_0, then p does not fork over M_0.*

Proof. Suppose $M_0 \prec M_1 \prec M_2$, $n < 3 \Rightarrow M_n \in K_\lambda$, $p_2 \in S^{bs}(M_2)$ does not fork over M_1 and $p_2 \restriction M_1$ does not fork over M_0. For $n < 2$ define $p_n = p_2 \restriction M_n$. By axiom f there is a type $q_2 \in S^{bs}(M_2)$ such that $q_2 \restriction M_0 = p_0$ and q_2 does not fork over M_0. Define $q_1 = q_2 \restriction M_1$. By axiom b (monotonicity) q_1 does not fork over M_0. So by axiom d (uniqueness) $q_1 = p_1$. Using again axiom e, we get $q_2 = p_2$, as they do not fork over M_1. By the definition of q_2 it does not fork over M_0. $\dashv$

Proposition 2.16. *Suppose*

(1) $\mathfrak{s}$ *satisfies the axioms of a semi-good* λ*-frame.*
(2) $n < 3 \Rightarrow M_0 \preceq M_n$.
(3) For $n = 1, 2$, $a_n \in M_n - M_0$ *and* $tp(a_n, M_0, M_n) \in S^{bs}(M_0)$.

Then there is an amalgamation M_3, f_1, f_2 *of* M_1, M_2 *over* M_0 *such that for* $n = 1, 2$ $tp(f_n(a_n), f_{3-n}[M_{3-n}], M_3)$ *does not fork over* M_0.

Proof. Suppose for $n = 1, 2$ $M_0 \prec M_n \wedge tp(a_n, M_0, M_n) \in S^{bs}(M_0)$. By Proposition 2.14.1 there are N_1, f_1 such that:

(1) $M_1 \preceq N_1$.
(2) $f_1 : M_2 \to N_1$ is an embedding over M_0.
(3) $tp(f_1(a_2), M_1, N_1)$ does not fork over M_0.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
M_2 \arrow[r, "f_1"] & N_1 \arrow[rr, "id"] & & N_2 \arrow[r, "id"] \arrow[d, "f_2"] & N_3 \\
& & N_2^* \arrow[ur, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & f_2[N_2] \arrow[ur, "id"] & \\
M_0 \arrow[uu, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] \arrow[urr, "id"] & M_1 \arrow[uu, "id"] & & &
\end{tikzcd}$$

By axiom f (the symmetry axiom), there are a model N_2, $N_1 \preceq N_2 \in K_\lambda$ and a model $N_2^* \in K_\lambda$ such that: $M_0 \bigcup \{f_1(a_2)\} \subseteq N_2^* \preceq N_2$ and $tp(a_1, N_2^*, N_2)$ does not fork over M_0.

By Proposition 2.14.2 (substituting N_2^*, N_2, N_2, a_1 which appear here instead of M_0, M_1, M_2, a there) there are N_3, f_2 such that:

(1) $N_2 \preceq N_3$.
(2) $f_2 : N_2 \to N_3$ is an embedding over N_2^*.
(3) $tp(a_1, f_2[N_2], N_3)$ does not fork over N_2^*.

So by Proposition 2.15 (on page 15), $tp(a_1, f_2[N_2], N_3)$ does not fork over M_0. So as $M_0 \preceq f_2 \circ f_1[M_2] \preceq f_2[N_2]$ by axiom b (monotonicity) $tp(a_1, f_2 \circ f_1[M_2], N_3)$ does not fork over M_0. As $f_2 \upharpoonright N_2^* = id_{N_2^*}$, $f_2(f_1(a_1)) = f_1(a_1)$. $\dashv$

Theorem 2.17. *Suppose* $\mathfrak{s}$ *satisfies conditions 1 and 2 of a semi-good* λ*-frame (so actually the relation* $\bigcup$ *is not relevant).*

(1) Suppose:
  (a) $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha \leq \lambda^+ \rangle$ *is an increasing continuous sequence of models in* K_λ.
  (b) There is a stationary set $S \subseteq \lambda^+$ *such that for every* $\alpha \in S$ *and every model* N, *with* $M_\alpha \prec N$ *there is a type* $p \in S(M_\alpha)$ *which is realized in* M_{λ^+} *and in* N.

  Then M_{λ^+} *is full over* M_0 *and is saturated in* λ^+ *over* λ.

(2) Suppose:
  (a) $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha \leq \lambda^+ \rangle$ *is an increasing continuous sequence of models in* K_λ.

  - (b) *For every $\alpha \in \lambda^+$ and every $p \in S^{bs}(M_\alpha)$ there is $\beta \in (\alpha, \lambda^+)$ such that p is realized in M_β.*

  Then M_{λ^+} is full over M_0 and M_{λ^+} is saturated in λ^+ over λ.
- (3) *There is a model in K_{λ^+} which is saturated in λ^+ over λ.*
- (4) *$M \in K_\lambda \Rightarrow |S(M)| \leq \lambda^+$.*

Proof. Obviously 1 ⇒ 2 and 3 ⇒ 4. To show 2 ⇒ 3, we construct a chain satisfying the hypotheses of 2. Let cd be an injection from $\lambda^+ \times \lambda^+$ onto λ^+. Define by induction on $\alpha < \lambda^+$ M_α and $\langle p_{\alpha,\beta} : \beta < \lambda^+ \rangle$ such that:

1. $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ is an increasing continuous sequence of models in K_λ.
2. $\{p_{\alpha,\beta} : \beta < \lambda^+\} = S^{bs}(M_\alpha)$.
3. $M_{\alpha+1}$ realizes $p_{\gamma,\beta}$, where we denote: $A_\alpha := \{cd(\gamma, \beta) : \gamma \leq \alpha,\ p_{\gamma,\beta}$ is not realized in $M_\alpha\}$, $\varepsilon_\alpha = \mathrm{Min}(A_\alpha)$ and $(\gamma, \beta) = cd^{-1}(\varepsilon_\alpha)$.

We argue that $M_{\lambda^+} := \bigcup\{M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+\}$ is saturated in λ^+ over λ. By 2 it is sufficient to prove that for every $\alpha \in \lambda^+$ and every $p \in S^{bs}(M_\alpha)$ there is $\beta \in (\alpha, \lambda^+)$ such that p is realized in M_β. Towards a contradiction choose α^* so that $p \in S^{bs}(M_{\alpha^*})$ is not realized in M_{λ^+}. There is $\beta < \lambda^+$ such that $p = p_{\alpha^*,\beta}$. Denote $\varepsilon := cd(\alpha^*, \beta)$. For every $\alpha \geq \alpha^*$ $\varepsilon \in A_\alpha$, so A_α is nonempty and ε_α is defined. But $\varepsilon_\alpha \neq \varepsilon$, (as otherwise p is realized in $M_{\alpha+1}$), so $\varepsilon_\alpha < \varepsilon$. The function $f : [\alpha^*, \lambda^+) \to \varepsilon$, $f(\alpha) = \varepsilon_\alpha$ is injection which is impossible.

It remains to prove item 1. Fix N, with $M_0 \prec N$. It is sufficient to prove that there is an embedding of N to M_{λ^+} over M_0. We choose $(\alpha_\varepsilon, N_\varepsilon, f_\varepsilon)$ by induction on $\varepsilon < \lambda^+$ such that:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
N \arrow[r, "id"] & N_\varepsilon \arrow[r, "id"] & N_{\varepsilon+1} \\
M_0 \arrow[u, "f_0"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_{\alpha_\varepsilon} \arrow[u, "f_\varepsilon"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_{\alpha_{\varepsilon+1}} \arrow[u, "f_{\varepsilon+1}"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

1. $\langle \alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \lambda^+ \rangle$ is an increasing continuous sequence of ordinals in λ^+.
2. The sequence $\langle N_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \lambda^+ \rangle$ is increasing and continuous.
3. $\langle f_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \lambda^+ \rangle$ is increasing continuous.
4. $N_0 := N$, $\alpha_0 := 0$ and $f_0 = id_{M_0}$.
5. $f_\varepsilon : M_{\alpha_\varepsilon} \to N_\varepsilon$ is an embedding.
6. For every $\alpha \in S$ there is $a \in M_{\alpha_{\varepsilon+1}} - M_{\alpha_\varepsilon}$ such that $f_{\varepsilon+1}(a) \in N_\varepsilon$.

By Proposition 1.31 we cannot carry out this construction. Where will we get stuck? For $\varepsilon = 0$ or limit we will not get stuck. Suppose we have defined $(\alpha_\zeta, N_\zeta, f_\zeta)$ for $\zeta \leq \varepsilon$. If $f_\varepsilon[M_{\alpha_\varepsilon}] = N_\varepsilon$ then $f_\varepsilon^{-1} \restriction N$ is an embedding of N into M_{λ^+} over M_0, hence we are finished. So without loss of generality $f_\varepsilon[M_{\alpha_\varepsilon}] \neq N_\varepsilon$. If $\alpha_\varepsilon \notin S$ then we define $\alpha_{\varepsilon+1} := \alpha_\varepsilon + 1$ and use the amalgamation in $(K_\lambda, \preceq\restriction K_\lambda)$ to find $N_{\varepsilon+1}, f_{\varepsilon+1}$ as needed.

Suppose $\alpha_\varepsilon \in S$. By the theorem's assumption, there is a type $p \in S(M_{\alpha_\varepsilon})$ such that p is realized in M_{λ^+} and $f_\varepsilon(p)$ is realized in N_ε. Define

$\alpha_{\varepsilon+1} := \text{Min}\{\alpha \in \lambda^+ : p \text{ is realized in } M_\alpha\}$. Take $a \in M_{\alpha_{\varepsilon+1}}$ such that $tp(a, M_{\alpha_\varepsilon}, M_{\alpha_{\varepsilon+1}}) = p$ and take $b \in N_\varepsilon$ such that $tp(b, f_\varepsilon(M_{\alpha_\varepsilon}), N_\varepsilon) = f_\varepsilon(p)$. Then $f_\varepsilon(tp(a, M_{\alpha_\varepsilon}, M_{\lambda^+})) = tp(b, M_{\alpha_\varepsilon}, N_\varepsilon)$. By the definition of type (Definition 1.21.1 on page 7), there are $N_{\varepsilon+1}, f_{\varepsilon+1}$ with $N_\varepsilon \preceq N_{\varepsilon+1}$, $f_{\varepsilon+1}$ is an embedding of $M_{\alpha_{\varepsilon+1}}$ into $N_{\varepsilon+1}$, $f_\varepsilon \subseteq f_{\varepsilon+1}$ and $f_{\varepsilon+1}(a) = b$.

Since the hypotheses of 5 applies to any cofinal segment of the sequence $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ and any submodel of size λ lies in some M_α we conclude that M_{λ^+} is saturated in λ^+ over λ. $\dashv$

2.1. non-forking with greater models.

Now we extend our non-forking notion to include models of cardinality greater than λ.

Definition 2.18. $\overset{\geq\lambda}{\bigcup\!\!\!\!\bigcup}$ is the class of quadruples (M_0, a, M_1, M_2) such that:

1. $M_0 \preceq M_1 \preceq M_2$.
2. $\lambda \leq ||M_0||$.
3. For some model $N_0 \in K_\lambda$ with $N_0 \preceq M_0$ for each model $N \in K_\lambda$, $N_0 \preceq N \preceq M_1 \Rightarrow \bigcup\!\!\!\!\bigcup(N_0, a, N, M_2)$.

Remark 2.19. If $\bigcup\!\!\!\!\bigcup(M_0, a, M_1, M_2)$ then $\overset{\geq\lambda}{\bigcup\!\!\!\!\bigcup}(M_0, a, M_1, M_2)$.

Definition 2.20. Let $M_0 \preceq M_1$ and $p \in S(M_1)$. We say that p does not fork over M_0, when for some triple $(M_1, M_2, a) \in p$ we have $\overset{\leq\lambda}{\bigcup\!\!\!\!\bigcup}(M_0, a, M_1, M_2)$.

Remark 2.21. We can replace the 'for some' in Definition 2.20 by 'for each'.

Definition 2.22. Let $M \in K_{>\lambda}$, $p \in S(M)$. p is said to be *basic* when there is $N \in K_\lambda$ such that $N \preceq M$ and p does not fork over N. For every $M \in K_{>\lambda}$, $S^{bs}_{>\lambda}(M)$ is the set of basic types over M. Sometimes we write $S^{bs}_{\geq\lambda}(M)$, meaning $S^{bs}(M)$ or $S^{bs}_{>\lambda}(M)$ (the unique difference is the cardinality of M).

Now we present a weak version of local character, which is peripheral in the continuation of this paper.

Definition 2.23. Let $\mathfrak{s}$ be a semi good frame except local character. $\mathfrak{s}$ is said to satisfy *weak local character for $\prec^*$-increasing sequences* when: If $\alpha^* < \lambda^+$ and $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha \leq \alpha^* + 1 \rangle$ is an $\prec^*$ $-$increasing continuous sequence of models, then for some element $a \in M_{\alpha^*+1} - M_{\alpha^*}$ and ordinal $\alpha < \alpha^*$, $tp(a, M_{\alpha^*}, M_{\alpha^*+1})$ does not fork over M_α.

Definition 2.24. Let $\mathfrak{s}$ be a semi good λ-frame except local character. $\mathfrak{s}$ is said to satisfy *weak local character for fast sequences* when for some relation $\prec^*$ the following hold:

1. $\prec^*$ is a relation on K_λ.
2. If $M_0 \prec^* M_1$ then $M_0 \preceq M_1$.
3. If $M_0 \prec^* M_1 \preceq M_2 \in K_\lambda$ then $M_0 \prec^* M_2$.
4. $\mathfrak{s}$ satisfies weak local character for $\prec^*$-increasing sequences.

(5) If $M_0 \in K_\lambda$, $M_0 \prec M_2 \in K_{\lambda^+}$, then there is a model $M_1 \in K_\lambda$ such that: $M_0 \prec^* M_1 \preceq M_2$.

Remark 2.25. If $\mathfrak{s}$ is a semi good λ-frame and $\prec^*$ is a relation on K_λ such that $M \prec^* N \Rightarrow M \preceq N$ then $\mathfrak{s}$ satisfies weak local character for $\prec^*$-increasing sequences.

The following theorem asserts that a non-forking relation in $(K_\lambda, \preceq \restriction K_\lambda)$ can be lifted to $K_{\geq\lambda}$ with many properties preserved.

Theorem 2.26. *Let $\mathfrak{s}$ be a semi-good λ-frame, except local character.*

(1) Density: If $\mathfrak{s}$ satisfies weak local character for fast sequences and $M \prec N$, $M \in K_{\geq\lambda}$ then there is $a \in N - M$ such that $tp(a, M, N) \in S^{bs}_{\geq\lambda}(M)$.

(2) Monotonicity: Suppose $M_0 \preceq M_1 \preceq M_2$, $n < 3 \Rightarrow M_n \in K_{\geq\lambda}$, $||M_2|| > \lambda$. If $p \in S^{bs}_{\geq\lambda}(M_2)$ does not fork over M_0, then
  - *(a) p does not fork over M_1.*
  - *(b) $p \restriction M_1$ does not fork over M_0.*

(3) Transitivity: Suppose $M_0, M_1, M_2 \in K_{\geq\lambda}$ and $M_0 \preceq M_1 \preceq M_2$. If $p \in S^{bs}_{\geq\lambda}(M_2)$ does not fork over M_1, and $p \restriction M_1$ does not fork over M_0, then p does not fork over M_0.

(4) About local character: Let δ be a limit ordinal. Suppose $\mathfrak{s}$ satisfies local character or $\lambda^+ \leq cf(\delta)$. If $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha \leq \delta \rangle$ is an increasing continuous sequence of models in $K_{>\lambda}$, and $p \in S^{bs}_{>\lambda}(M_\delta)$ then there is $\alpha < \delta$ such that p does not fork over M_α.

(5) Continuity: Suppose $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha \leq \delta + 1 \rangle$ is an increasing continuous sequence of models in $K_{\geq\lambda}$. Let $c \in M_{\delta+1} - M_\delta$. Denote $p_\alpha = tp(c, M_\alpha, M_{\delta+1})$. If for every $\alpha < \delta$, p_α does not fork over M_0, then p_δ does not fork over M_0.

Proof. (1) Density: Suppose $M \prec N$.
Case 1: $||M|| = \lambda$. Choose $a \in N - M$. $LST(K, \preceq) \leq \lambda$ and so there is $N^* \prec N$ such that: $||N^*|| = \lambda$ and $M \bigcup \{a\} \subseteq N^*$. By axiom e of a.e.c $M \preceq N^*$ But $a \in N^* - M$ and so $M \prec N^*$. By the existence axiom in $\mathfrak{s}$, there is $c \in N^* - M$ such that $tp(c, M, N^*)$ is basic. So $tp(c, M, N) \in S^{bs}(M)$.
Case 2: $||M|| > \lambda$. We choose M_n, N_n by induction on $n < \omega$ such that:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
c \in N_n \arrow[rr, "id"] & & N_n \arrow[r, "id"] & N_\omega \arrow[r, "id"] & N \\
M_n \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_{n,c} \arrow[r, "id"] & M_{n+1} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & N_\omega \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M \arrow[u, "id"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

(a) $\langle N_n : n \leq \omega \rangle$ is an $\prec$ $-$increasing continuous sequence of models in K_λ.
(b) $\langle M_n : n \leq \omega \rangle$ is an $\prec^*$ $-$increasing continuous sequence of models in K_λ.
(c) $M_n \prec M$ (see the end of Definition 2.1).
(d) $N_n \prec N$.

(e) $N_0 \not\subseteq M$.
(f) For every $c \in N_n$, $M_{n,c} \subseteq M_{n+1}$ where we choose $M_{n,c} \in K_\lambda$ such that: If $tp(c, M_n, N_n) \in S^{bs}(M_n)$ but does fork over M_n then $M_{n,c}$ is a witness for this, namely $M_n \prec M_{n,c} \prec M$ and $tp(c, M_{n,c}, N)$ forks over M_n. Otherwise $M_{n,c} = M_n$.

The construction is of course possible.

Now we define $M_\omega := \bigcup\{M_n : n < \omega\}$ and $N_\omega := \bigcup\{N_n : n < \omega\}$. By axiom 1.1.1.d (smoothness) $M_\omega \preceq N_\omega$. By the local character for $\prec^*$-increasing sequences, for some element $c \in N_\omega - M_\omega$ and there is $n < \omega$ such that $tp(c, M_\omega, N_\omega) \in S^{bs}(M_\omega)$ does not fork over M_n. By the monotonicity without loss of generality $c \in N_n$. We will prove that $tp(c, M, N)$ does not fork over M_ω. Take M^* with $M_\omega \prec M^* \prec M$. By way of contradiction suppose $tp(c, M^*, N)$ forks over M_ω. By the monotonicity in $\mathfrak{s}$ (axiom b), $tp(c, M^*, N)$ forks over M_n. So by the definition of $M_{n,c}$, $tp(c, M_{n,c}, N)$ forks over M_n. Hence by axiom b (monotonicity) $tp(c, M_\omega, N)$ forks over M_n, a contradiction.

(2) Monotonicity: We use the same witness.

(3) Transitivity:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
& N \arrow[r, "id"] & N^{**} \arrow[r, "id"] & M_2 & p \\
N_1 \arrow[rr, "id"] & & N^* \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_1 \arrow[u, "id"] & \\
& N_0 \arrow[uu, "id"] \arrow[ur, "id"] \arrow[rr, "id"] & & M_0 \arrow[u, "id"] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Suppose $M_0 \prec M_1 \prec M_2$, $p \in S^{bs}(M_2)$ does not fork over M_1 and $p \restriction M_1$ does not fork over M_0. We can find $N_0 \prec M_0$ such that N_0 witnesses that $p \restriction M_1$ does not fork over M_0. We will prove that N_0 witnesses that p does not fork over M_0. Let $N \in K_\lambda$ be such that $N_0 \prec N \prec M_2$. We have to prove that $p \restriction N$ does not fork over N_0. First we find a model N_1 that witnesses that p does not fork over M_1. As $LST(K, \preceq) \leq \lambda$ there is $N^* \in K_\lambda$ such that $N_0 \bigcup N_1 \subseteq N^* \preceq M_1$ and there is $N^{**} \in K_\lambda$ such that $N^* \bigcup N \subseteq N^{**} \preceq M_2$. As N_1 witnesses that p does not fork over M_1, $p \restriction N^{**}$ does not fork over N_1. By the Definition 2.1.3.b (monotonicity), $p \restriction N^{**}$ does not fork over N^*. N_0 witnesses that $p \restriction M_1$ does not fork over M_0, so $p \restriction N^*$ does not fork over N_0. By the transitivity proposition (Proposition 2.15), $p \restriction N^{**}$ does not fork over N_0. So by Definition 2.1.3.b (monotonicity), $p \restriction N$ does not fork over N_0.

(4) About local character: Let $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \delta \rangle$ be an increasing continuous sequence of models in $K_{>\lambda}$. Let $p \in S^{bs}_{>\lambda}(M_\delta)$ and N^* a witness for this, i.e. p does not fork over $N^* \in K_\lambda$. Let $\langle \alpha(\varepsilon) : \varepsilon \leq cf(\delta) \rangle$ be an increasing continuous sequence of ordinals with $\alpha(cf(\delta)) = \delta$.

Case a: $\lambda^+ \leq cf(\delta)$. By cardinality considerations, there is $\varepsilon < cf(\delta)$ such that: $N^* \subseteq M_{\alpha(\varepsilon)}$. By axiom 1.1.1.e $N^* \preceq M_{\alpha(\varepsilon)}$. As N^* witnesses that the type p is basic, by Definition 2.18 N^* witnesses that p does not fork over $M_{\alpha(\varepsilon)}$.

Case b: $\mathfrak{s}$ satisfies local character and $cf(\delta) \leq \lambda$. Using $LST(K, \preceq) \leq \lambda$ and smoothness, we can choose $N_{\alpha(\varepsilon)}$ by induction on $\varepsilon \leq cf(\delta)$ such that:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
N^* \arrow[r, "id"] & N_\delta \arrow[r, "id"] & M_\delta & p \\
 & N_{\alpha(\varepsilon)} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_{\alpha(\varepsilon)} \arrow[u, "id"] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

(a) $N_{\alpha(\varepsilon)} \in K_\lambda$.
(b) $\langle N_{\alpha(\varepsilon)} : \varepsilon \leq cf(\delta)\rangle$ is an increasing continuous sequence.
(c) $M_{\alpha(\varepsilon)} \bigcap N^* \subseteq N_{\alpha(\varepsilon)} \preceq M_{\alpha(\varepsilon)}$.

By axiom 1.1.1.e $N^* \preceq N_\delta \preceq M_\delta$. Since p does not fork over N^*, by monotonicity (Theorem 2.26.2) p does not fork over N_δ. By local character, for some $\varepsilon < cf(\delta)$, $p \restriction N_\delta$ does not fork over $N_{\alpha(\varepsilon)}$. By transitivity (Theorem 2.26.3), p does not fork over $N_{\alpha(\varepsilon)}$. By monotonicity (Theorem 2.26.2), p does not fork over $M_{\alpha(\varepsilon)}$.

(5) Continuity: For every $\alpha \in \delta$ denote $p_\alpha := p \restriction M_\alpha$. p_7 does not fork over M_0. So for some $N_0 \in K_\lambda$, $N_0 \preceq M_0$ and p_7 does not fork over N_0. By monotonicity (Theorem 2.26.2) and transitivity (Theorem 2.26.2) for every $\alpha < \delta$ p_α does not fork over N_0. We will prove that p does not fork over N_0. Take $N^* \in K_\lambda$ with $N_0 \preceq N^* \preceq M_\delta$. We have to prove that $p \restriction N^*$ does not fork over N_0. Let $\langle \alpha(\varepsilon) : \varepsilon \leq cf(\delta)\rangle$ be an increasing continuous sequence of ordinals with $\alpha(cf(\delta)) = \delta$.

Case a: $\lambda^+ \leq cf(\delta)$. By cardinality considerations there is $\varepsilon < cf(\delta)$ such that $N^* \subseteq M_{\alpha(\varepsilon)}$. But $M_{\alpha(\varepsilon)} \preceq M_\delta$ and $N^* \preceq M_\delta$, so by axiom 1.1.1.e $N^* \preceq M_{\alpha(\varepsilon)}$. Since $p_{\alpha(\varepsilon)}$ does not fork over N_0, by monotonicity (Theorem 2.26.2) $p \restriction N^*$ does not fork over N_0.

Case b: $cf(\delta) \leq \lambda^+$. We choose $N_{\alpha(\varepsilon)}$ by induction on $\varepsilon \in (0, cf(\delta)]$ such that:

(a) The sequence $\langle N_{\alpha(\varepsilon)} : \varepsilon \leq cf(\delta)\rangle$ is increasing continuous.
(b) $\varepsilon \leq cf(\delta) \Rightarrow N^* \bigcap M_{\alpha(\varepsilon)} \subseteq N_{\alpha(\varepsilon)} \preceq M_{\alpha(\varepsilon)}$.
(c) $N_{\alpha(\varepsilon)} \in K_\lambda$.

For every $\varepsilon < \mathrm{cf}(\delta)$, $p_{\alpha(\varepsilon)}$ does not fork over N_0, so $p \restriction N_{\alpha(\varepsilon)}$ does not fork over N_0. So by Definition 2.1.3.g (continuity) (in $\mathfrak{s}$), $p \restriction N_\delta$ does not fork over N_0. $N^* \subseteq N_\delta$, hence by axiom 1.1.1.e $N^* \preceq N_\delta$. Therefore by Definition 2.1.3.b (monotonicity), $p \restriction N^*$ does not fork over N_0.

$\dashv$

3. THE DECOMPOSITION AND AMALGAMATION METHOD

Discussion. In section 2 we defined an extension of the non-forking notion to cardinals bigger than λ. But we did not prove all the good frame axioms. The purpose from here until the end of the paper is to construct a good λ^+-frame, which is derived from the semi good λ-frame. In a sense, the main problem is that amalgamation in $(K_\lambda, \preceq\restriction K_\lambda)$ does not imply amalgamation in $(K_{\lambda^+}, \preceq\restriction K_{\lambda^+})$. Suppose for $n < 3$ $M_n \in K_{\lambda^+}$, $M_0 \preceq M_n$ and we want to amalgamate M_1, M_2 over M_0. We take representation of M_0, M_1, M_2. We want to amalgamate M_1, M_2 by amalgamating their representations. For this goal, we will find in section 5, a relation of "a canonical amalgamation" or "a non-forking amalgamation". Sections 3,4 are preparations for section 5. If the reader wants to know the plan of the other sections now, he may see the discussion at the beginning of section 10.

The decomposition and amalgamation method. Suppose for $n = 1, 2$ $M_0 \preceq M_n$ and we want to prove that there is an amalgamation of M_1, M_2 over M_0 which satisfies specific properties (for example disjointness or uniqueness, see below). Sometimes there is a property of triples, $K^{3,*} \subseteq K^3$ such that if $(M_0, M_1, a) \in K^{3,*}$ and $(M_0, M_1, a) \preceq (M_2, M_3, a)$ then the amalgamation M_3 satisfies the required property. A classic example of this property in the context of fields is 'M_1 is the algebraic closure of $M_0 \bigcup \{a\}$. What can we do, if there is no $a \in M_1 - M_0$ such that $(M_0, M_1, a) \in K^{3,*}$? Theorem 3.8 says under some assumptions that we can decompose an extension of M_1 over M_0 by triples in $K^{3,*}$. By Proposition 3.4.2 we may amalgamate M_2 with the decomposition we have obtained.

Applications of the decomposition and amalgamation method.

1. By Proposition 3.4(2) there is no $\preceq$-maximal model in K_{λ^+}.
2. By Proposition 3.13 the uniqueness triples are dense with respect to $\preceq_{bs}$ (see Definition 3.2.2). It enables to prove Theorem 3.14 (the disjoint amalgamation existence), by the decomposition and disjoint method.
3. By assumption 5.1 the uniqueness triples are dense with respect to $\preceq_{bs}$. The density enables to prove Theorem 5.11 (the exitance theorem for NF).
4. Using again assumption 5.1, we prove Proposition 5.19 . But for this, we have to prove Proposition 3.5, a generalization of 3.4, which says that we can amalgamate two sequences of models, not just a model and a sequence.

Hypothesis 3.1. $\mathfrak{s}$ is a semi good λ-frame, except basic weak stability and local character.

3.1. **The a.e.c. $(K^{3,bs}, \preceq_{bs})$ and amalgamations.**

Definition 3.2.

1. $K^{3,bs} =: \{(M,N,a) : M,N \in K_\lambda,\ a \in N - M$ and $tp(a,M,N) \in S^{bs}(M)\}$.
2. $\preceq_{bs}$ is the relation on $K^{3,bs}$ defined by: $(M,N,a) \preceq_{bs} (M*,N^*,a^*)$ iff $M \preceq M^*,\ N \preceq N^*,\ a^* = a$ and $tp(a,M^*,N^*)$ does not fork over M.
3. The sequence $\langle (M_\alpha,N_\alpha,a) : \alpha < \theta\rangle$ is said to be $\preceq_{bs}$-increasing continuous if $\alpha < \theta \Rightarrow (M_\alpha,N_\alpha,a) \preceq_{bs} (M_{\alpha+1},N_{\alpha+1},a)$ and the sequences $\langle (M_\alpha : \alpha < \theta\rangle,\ \langle N_\alpha : \alpha < \theta\rangle$ are continuous (and clearly also increasing).

Proposition 3.3. *$(K^{3,bs}, \preceq_{bs})$ is an a.e.c. in λ and it has no $\preceq_{bs}$-maximal model.*

Proof. First we note that $K^{3,bs}$ is not the empty set [There is $M \in K_\lambda$, and as it has no $\preceq$-maximal model, there is $N \in K_\lambda$ with $M \prec N$. Now by Definition 2.1.3.f, there is $a \in N - M$ such that $tp(M,N,a) \in S^{bs}(M)$]. Why is axiom c of a.e.c. (defintion 1.1.1.c) satisfied? Suppose $\delta < \lambda^+$ and $\langle (M_\alpha,N_\alpha,a) : \alpha < \delta\rangle$ is increasing and continuous. Denote $M = \bigcup\{M_\alpha : \alpha < \delta\},\ N = \bigcup\{N_\alpha : \alpha < \delta\}$. By axiom c of a.e.c., $M,N \in K_\lambda,\ \alpha < \delta \Rightarrow M_\alpha \preceq M,\ N_\alpha \preceq N$. By the definition of $\preceq_{bs}$ for every $\alpha < \delta$, $tp(a,M_\alpha,N_\alpha)$ does not fork over M_0. So by Definition 2.1.3.g (continuity), $tp(a,M,N)$ is basic and does not fork over M_0. By the smoothness, $M \preceq N$. By axiom c of a.e.c. $M_0 \preceq M$ and $N_0 \preceq N$. So $(M_0,N_0,a) \preceq_{bs} (M,N,a) \in K^{3,bs}$. Why is the smoothness satisfied? Suppose $\langle (M_\alpha,N_\alpha,a) : \alpha \leq \delta+1\rangle$ is continuous and for $\alpha < \beta \leq \delta+1$, we have $\alpha \neq \delta \Rightarrow (M_\alpha,N_\alpha,a) \preceq_{bs} (M_\beta,N_\beta,a)$. So $\delta \neq \alpha < \beta \leq \delta+1 \Rightarrow M_\alpha \preceq M_\beta$. But by the continuity of the sequence $\langle (M_\alpha,N_\alpha,a) : \alpha \leq \delta+1\rangle$ we have $M_\delta = \bigcup\{M_\alpha : \alpha < \delta\}$. So by the smoothness of $(K,\preceq)$, $M_\delta \preceq M_{\delta+1}$. In a similar way $N_\delta \preceq N_{\delta+1}$. $(M_0,N_0,a) \preceq_{bs} (M_{\delta+1},N_{\delta+1},a)$, so by the definition, $tp(a,M_{\delta+1},N_{\delta+1})$ does not fork over M_0. Therefore by Definition 2.1.3.b (monotonicity), $tp(a,M_{\delta+1},N_{\delta+1})$ does not fork over M_δ. Why does $(K^{3,bs},\preceq_{bs})$ satisfy axiom 1.1.1.e? Suppose $(M_0,N_0,a) \subseteq (M_1,N_1,a) \preceq (M_2,N_2,a),\ (M_0,N_0,a) \preceq_{bs} (M_2,N_2,a)$. By the definition of $\preceq_{bs}$ we have $M_0 \subseteq M_1 \preceq M_2$ and $M_0 \preceq M_2$. Hence by axiom 1.1.1.e we have $M_0 \preceq M_1$. In a similar way $N_0 \preceq N_1$. By the definition of $\preceq_{bs}$, $tp(a,M_2,N_2)$ does not fork over M_0. By 2.1.3.b (monotonicity), $tp(a,M_1,N_1)$ does not fork over M_0. So $(M_0,N_0,a) \preceq_{bs} (M_1,N_1,a)$. Why is there no maximal element in $(K^{3,bs},\preceq_{bs})$? Let $(M_0,N_0,a) \in K^{3,bs}$. In K_λ there is no $\preceq$-maximal element, and so there is $M_0 \prec M_1^* \in K_\lambda$. By Proposition 2.16 there is $N_0 \preceq N_1 \in K_\lambda$ and there is an embedding $f : M_1^* \to N_1$ such that $tp(a,M_1,N_1)$ does not fork over M_0 where $M_1 := f[M_1^*]$. Hence $(M_0,N_0,a) \preceq_{bs} (M_1,N_1,a)$. $\dashv$

Proposition 3.4.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
N_0 \arrow[r, "id"] & N_1 \arrow[r, "id"] & N_2 \arrow[r, "id"] & N_\alpha \arrow[r, "id"] & N_{\alpha+1} \arrow[r, "id"] & N_\theta \\
M_0 \arrow[r, "id"] \arrow[u, "id"] & M_1 \arrow[r, "id"] \arrow[u, "id"] & M_2 \arrow[r, "id"] \arrow[u, "id"] & M_\alpha \arrow[r, "id"] \arrow[u, "id"] & M_{\alpha+1} \arrow[r, "id"] \arrow[u, "id"] & M_\theta \arrow[u, "id"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

1. *Let $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha \leq \theta \rangle$ be an increasing continuous sequence of models in K_λ. Let $N \in K_\lambda$ with $M_0 \prec N$, and for $\alpha < \theta$, let $a_\alpha \in M_{\alpha+1} - M_\alpha$, $(M_\alpha, M_{\alpha+1}, a_\alpha) \in K^{3,bs}$ and $b \in N - M_0$, $(M_0, N, b) \in K^{3,bs}$. Then there are $f, \langle N_\alpha : \alpha \leq \theta \rangle$ such that:*
   - *(a) f is an isomorphism of N to N_0 over M_0.*
   - *(b) $\langle N_\alpha : \alpha \leq \theta \rangle$ is an increasing continuous sequence.*
   - *(c) $M_\alpha \preceq N_\alpha$.*
   - *(d) $tp(a_\alpha, N_\alpha, N_{\alpha+1})$ does not fork over M_α.*
   - *(e) $tp(f(b), M_\alpha, N_\alpha)$ does not fork over M_0.*
2. *$K_{\lambda^+} \neq \emptyset$, and it has no $\preceq$-maximal model.*
3. *There is a model in K of cardinality λ^{+2}.*

Proof. (1) First we explain the idea of the proof. If we 'fix' the models in the sequence $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha \leq \theta \rangle$, then we will 'change' N θ times. So in limit steps we will be in a problem. The solution is to fix N, and 'change' the sequence $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha \leq \theta \rangle$. At the end of the proof we 'return the sequence to its place'.

The proof itself: We choose (N^*_α, f_α) by induction on α such that $(*)_\alpha$ holds where $(*)_\alpha$ is:

(i) $\alpha \leq \theta \Rightarrow N^*_\alpha \in K_\lambda$.
(ii) $(N^*_0, f_0) = (N, id_{M_0})$.
(iii) The sequence $\langle N^*_\alpha : \alpha \leq \theta \rangle$ is increasing and continuous.
(iv) For every $\alpha \leq \theta$, the function f_α is an embedding of M_α to N^*_α.
(v) The sequence $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha \leq \theta \rangle$ is increasing and continuous.
(vi) For every $\alpha < \theta$ $tp(f_\alpha(a_\alpha), N^*_\alpha, N^*_{\alpha+1})$ does not fork over $f_\alpha[M_\alpha]$.
(vii) For every $\alpha \leq \theta$ $tp(b, f_\alpha[M_\alpha], N^*_\alpha)$ does not fork over M_0.

Now $f_\theta : M_\theta \to N^*_\theta$ is an embedding. Extend f^{-1}_θ to a function with domain N^*_θ and define $f := g \restriction N$. Define $N_\alpha := g[N^*_\alpha]$.

(2) $K_{\lambda^+} \neq \emptyset$, as we can choose an increasing continuous sequence of models in K_λ, $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$, and so its union is a model in K_{λ^+} [As there is no $\preceq$-maximal model in K_λ and in limit step use axiom 1.1.1.c].

Why is there no maximal model in K_{λ^+}? Let $M \in K_{\lambda^+}$. Let $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ be a representation of M. By the Definition 2.1.3.f (existence, on page 11), for every $\alpha \in \lambda^+$ there is an element $a_\alpha \in M_{\alpha+1} - M_\alpha$ (we do not use a_α, but as we have written it in 1, for shortness, we have to write it here). As in K_λ there is no maximal model, there is a model N such that $M_0 \prec N \in K_\lambda$ and without loss of generality $N \bigcap M = M_0$. By Definition 2.1.2.c (the density of basic types), there is $b \in N - M_0$ such that $tp(b, M_0, N)$ is basic. Now by Proposition 3.4.1, there is an increasing continuous sequence

$\langle N_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+\rangle$ and f such that $f : N \to N_0$ is an isomorphism over M_0 and for $\alpha \in \lambda^+$ we have $M_\alpha \preceq N_\alpha$ and $tp(f(b), M_\alpha, N_\alpha)$ does not fork over M_0. So by Definition 2.1, (on page 11), $f(b)$ does not belong to M_α for $\alpha \in \lambda^+$. So $f(b)$ does not belong to M. But it belongs to N_{λ^+}, so $M \neq N_{\lambda^+}$, and for this we defined b. But it is easy to see that $M \subseteq N_{\lambda^+}$ and $N_{\lambda^+} \in K_{\lambda^+}$. By the smoothness (i.e. Definition 1.1.1.d on page 3) $M \preceq N_{\lambda^+}$. So M is not a maximal model.

(3) We construct a strictly increasing continuous sequence of models in K_{λ^+}, $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^{+2}\rangle$. So its union is a model in $K_{\lambda^{+2}}$. As by 2 there is no maximal model in K_{λ^+}, there is no problem to choose this sequence. $\dashv$

Proposition 3.5 (a rectangle which amalgamate two sequences)**.** *For $x = a, b$ let $\langle M_{x,\alpha} : \alpha < \theta^x\rangle$ be an increasing continuous sequence of models in K_λ such that $M_{a,0} = M_{b,0}$ and let $\langle d_{x,\alpha} : \alpha < \theta^x\rangle$ be a sequence such that $d_{x,\alpha} \in M_{x,\alpha+1} - M_{x,\alpha}$, and the type $tp(d_{x,\alpha}, M_{x,\alpha}, M_{x,\alpha+1})$ is basic. Denote $\alpha^* = \theta^a$, $\beta^* = \theta^b$. Then there are a "rectangle of models" $\{M_{\alpha,\beta} : \alpha < \alpha^*,\ \beta < \beta^*\}$ and a sequence $\langle f_\beta : \beta < \beta^*\rangle$ such that:*

1. *$(\alpha < \alpha^* \wedge \beta < \beta^*) \Rightarrow M_{\alpha,\beta} \in K_\lambda$.*
2. *$f_\beta : M_{b,\beta} \to M_{0,\beta}$ is an isomorphism.*
3. *$M_{\alpha,0} = M_{a,\alpha}$.*
4. *f_0 is the identity on $M_{a,0} = M_{b,0}$.*
5. *$\langle f_\beta : \beta < \beta^*\rangle$ is increasing and continuous.*
6. *For every α, β which satisfies $\alpha + 1 < \alpha^*$ and $\beta < \beta^*$, the type $tp(d_{a,\alpha}, M_{\alpha,\beta}, M_{\alpha+1,\beta})$ does not fork over $M_{\alpha,0}$.*
7. *For every α, β which satisfies $\alpha < \alpha^*$ and $\beta + 1 < \beta^*$, the type $tp(d_{b,\beta}, M_{\alpha,\beta}, M_{\alpha,\beta+1})$ does not fork over $M_{0,\beta}$.*
8. *If $\bigcup\{Im(f_\beta) : \beta < \beta^*\} \bigcap \bigcup\{M_{a,\alpha} : \alpha < \alpha^*\} = \bigcup\{M_{b,\beta} : \beta < \beta^*\} \bigcap \bigcup\{M_{a,\alpha} : \alpha < \alpha^*\} = M_{a,0}$, then $(\forall\beta \in \beta^*) f_\beta = id \restriction M_{b,\beta}$.*
9. *For all $\alpha(1) < \alpha^*$ the sequence $\langle M_{\alpha(1),\beta} : \beta < \beta^*\rangle$ is increasing and continuous.*
10. *For all $\beta(1) < \beta^*$ the sequence $\langle M_{\alpha,\beta(1)} : \alpha < \alpha^*\rangle$ is increasing and continuous.*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
d_{a,\alpha} \in M_{\alpha+1,0} = M_{a,\alpha+1} \arrow[r, "id"] & M_{\alpha+1,\beta} \arrow[r, "id"] & M_{\alpha+1,\beta+1} \\
M_{\alpha,0} = M_{a,\alpha} \arrow[r, "id"] \arrow[u, "id"] & M_{\alpha,\beta} \arrow[r, "id"] \arrow[u, "id"] & M_{\alpha,\beta+1} \arrow[u, "id"] \\
M_{0,0} = M_{a,0} = M_{b,0} \arrow[r, "id"] \arrow[u, "id"] & M_{0,\beta} = f_\beta[M_{b,\beta}] \arrow[r, "id"] \arrow[u, "id"] & M_{0,\beta+1} = f_{\beta+1}[M_{b,\beta+1}] \arrow[u, "id"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

Proof. We define by induction on $\beta < \beta^*$ $f_\beta, \{M_{\alpha,\beta} : \alpha < \alpha^*\}$ such that the conditions 1-6 and 8,9 are satisfied. For $\beta = 0$ see 3,4. For β a limit ordinal, we define $f_\beta = \bigcup\{f_\gamma : \gamma < \beta\}$, $M_{\alpha,\beta} = \bigcup\{M_{\alpha,\gamma} : \gamma < \beta\}$.

Why does 6 satisfy, i.e. why for every α, does $tp(d_{a,\alpha}, M_{\alpha,\beta}, M_{\alpha+1,\beta})$ not fork over $M_{\alpha,0}$? By the induction hypothesis 6 is satisfied for every $\gamma < \beta$, i.e. $tp(d_{a,\alpha}, M_{\alpha,\gamma}, M_{\alpha+1,\gamma}) = tp(d_{a,\alpha}, M_{\alpha,\gamma}, M_{\alpha+1,\gamma})$ does not fork over $M_{0,\gamma}$. By Definition 2.1.3.b (monotonicity) and Definition 2.1.3.g (continuity) $tp(d_{a,\alpha}, M_{\alpha,\beta}, M_{\alpha+1,\beta})$ does not fork over $M_{\alpha,0}$. So condition 6 is satisfied. For $\beta = \gamma + 1$ use Proposition 3.4.1. So we can carry out the induction. Now without loss of generality condition 7 is satisfied too. $\dashv$

3.2. **Decomposition.** When we speak about $tp(a, M, N)$ the order of N is peripheral. Now we consider classes $K^{3,*}$ of triples (M, N, a) where the order of N is very important. For example N is the algebraic closure of $M \bigcup \{a\}$, where $(K, \preceq)$ is the class of fields with the partial order of being sub-field.

Definition 3.6. Let $K^{3,*} \subseteq K^{3,bs}$ be closed under isomorphisms.

1. $K^{3,*}$ is *dense with respect to* $\preceq_{bs}$ if for every $(M, N, a) \in K^{3,bs}$ there is $(M^*, N^*, a^*) \in K^{3,*}$ such that $(M, N, a) \preceq_{bs} (M^*, N^*, a^*)$.
2. $K^{3,*}$ *has existence* if for every $(M, N, a) \in K^{3,bs}$ there are N^*, a^* such that $tp(a^*, M, N^*) = tp(a, M, N)$ and $(M, N^*, a^*) \in K^{3,*}$. In other words if $p \in S^{bs}(M)$ then $p \bigcap K^{3,*} \neq \emptyset$.

Definition 3.7. Let $K^{3,*} \subseteq K^{3,bs}$ be closed under isomorphisms. We say that M^* is *decomposable by* $K^{3,*}$ over M, if there is a sequence $\langle d_\varepsilon, N_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \alpha^* \rangle^\frown \langle N_{\alpha^*} \rangle$ such that:

1. $\varepsilon < \alpha^* \Rightarrow N_\varepsilon \in K_\lambda$.
2. $\langle N_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \preceq \alpha^* \rangle$ is increasing and continuous.
3. $N_0 = M$.
4. $N_{1,\alpha^*} = M^*$.
5. $(N_\varepsilon, N_{\varepsilon+1}, d_\varepsilon) \in K^{3,*}$.

In such a case we say that the sequence $\langle d_\varepsilon, N_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \alpha^* \rangle^\frown \langle N_{\alpha^*} \rangle$ is a decomposition of M^* over M by $K^{3,*}$. The main case is $K^{3,*} = K^{3,uq}$ (which we have not defined yet), and in such a case we may omit it.

Theorem 3.8 (the extensions decomposition theorem)**.** *Let $K^{3,*} \subseteq K^{3,bs}$ be closed under isomorphisms.*

1. *Suppose $\mathfrak{s}$ has conjugation. If $K^{3,*}$ is dense with respect to $\preceq_{bs}$ then it has existence.*
2. *Suppose $K^{3,*}$ has existence. If $N \in K_\lambda$ and $p = tp(a, M, N) \in S^{bs}(M)$ then there are N^*, N^+ such that $(M, N^*, a) \in K^{3,*} \bigcap p$, $N \preceq N^+$, $N^* \preceq N^+$.*
3. *Suppose $K^{3,*}$ has existence and $M \prec N$. Then there is $M^* \succeq N$ such that M^* is decomposable over M by $K^{3,*}$. Moreover, letting $a \in N - M$, $tp(a, M, N)$ is basic, we can choose $d_0 = a$, where d_0 is the element which appears in Definition 3.7.*

Proof. (1) Suppose $p = tp(M, N, a) \in S^{bs}(M)$. As $K^{3,*}$ is dense with respect to $\preceq_{bs}$, there are M^*, N^*, b with $(M, N, a) \preceq_{bs} (M^*, N^*, b)$. As $\mathfrak{s}$

has conjugation, $p^* =: tp(M^*, N^*, b)$ conjugate to p. $K^{3,*}$ is closed under isomorphisms and so $p \bigcap K^{3,*} \neq \emptyset$.
(2) $K^{3,*}$ has existence and so there are b, N^* such that: $tp(b, M, N^*) = p$, $(M, N^*, b) \in K^{3,*}$. By the definition of a type (i.e. the definition of equivalence between triples in a type), there are a model N^+, $N \preceq N^+$ and an embedding $f : N^* \to N^+$ over M such that $f(b) = a$. Denote $N^{**} = f[N^*]$. Now as $K^{3,*}$ respects isomorphisms, $(M, N^{**}, a) \in K^{3,*}$. $M \preceq N^{**} \preceq N^+$.
(3) Assume toward a contradiction that $M \prec N$ and there is no M^* as required. We try to construct $M_\alpha, a_\alpha, N_\alpha$ by induction on $\alpha \in \lambda^+$ such that (see the diagram below):
(a) $M_0 = M,\ N_0 = N$.
(b) $(M_\alpha, M_{\alpha+1}, d_\alpha) \in K^{3,*}$.
(c) $M_\alpha \preceq N_\alpha$.
(d) For every $\alpha \in \lambda^+,\ d_\alpha \in M_{\alpha+1} \bigcap N_\alpha - M_\alpha$.
(e) The sequence $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ is increasing and continuous.
(f) The sequence $\langle N_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ is increasing and continuous.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
N_0 \arrow[r, "id"] & N_1 \arrow[r, "id"] & N_\alpha & \\
M_0 \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_1 \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_\alpha \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_{\alpha+1} \ni a_\alpha
\end{tikzcd}$$

We cannot succeed because otherwise substituting the sequences $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha \in \lambda^+ \rangle$, $\langle N_\alpha : \alpha \in \lambda^+ \rangle$, $\langle id_{M_\alpha} : \alpha \in \lambda^+ \rangle$ in Proposition 1.31 we get a contradiction. So where will we get stuck? For $\alpha = 0$ there is no problem. For α limit take unions. 3 is satisfied by (smoothness) (Definition 1.1.1.d). What will we do for $\alpha+1$, (assuming we have defined $(M_\alpha, N_\alpha, d_\alpha)$? If $N_\alpha = M_\alpha$ then N_α is decomposable over M by $K^{3,*}$ and the proof has reached to its end. Otherwise by the existence of the basic types (2.1), there is $d_\alpha \in N_\alpha - M_\alpha$ such that $(M_\alpha, N_\alpha, d_\alpha) \in K^{3,bs}$ (and for the "more over" take $d_0 = a$ if $\alpha = 0$). By assumption $K^{3,*}$ has existence, so there are $d^*_\alpha, M^*_{\alpha+1}$ such that: $(M_\alpha, M^*_{\alpha+1}, d^*_\alpha) \in K^{3,*}$, $tp(d^*_\alpha, M_\alpha, M^*_{\alpha+1}) = tp(d_\alpha, M_\alpha, N_\alpha)$. By the definition of a type, there are $N_{\alpha+1}$, $N_\alpha \preceq N_{\alpha+1}$ and an embedding $f : M^*_{\alpha+1} \to N_{\alpha+1}$ over M_α such that $f(d^*_\alpha) = d_\alpha$. Denote $M_{\alpha+1} = Im(f)$. We have $N_\alpha \preceq N_{\alpha+1}$, $M_{\alpha+1} \preceq N_{\alpha+1}$ and $(M_\alpha, M_{\alpha+1}, d_\alpha) \in K^{3,*}$. So 2,3,4 are guaranteed. $\dashv$

Proposition 3.9 (existence of decomposition over two models)**.** *If* $n < 2 \Rightarrow M_n \preceq N$ *then there is* M^* *such that:* $N \preceq M^*$ *and* M^* *is decomposable over* M_0 *and over* M_1.

Proof. Choose an increasing continuous sequence $\langle M_n : 2 \preceq n \leq \omega \rangle$ such that:

1. $N \preceq M_2$.
2. For every $n \in \omega$, M_{n+2} is decomposable over M_n.

The construction is possible by Theorem 3.8. Now by the following proposition M_ω is decomposable over M_0 and M_1. $\dashv$

Proposition 3.10 (the decomposable extensions transitivity)**.** *Let* $\langle M_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \leq \alpha^* \rangle$ *be an increasing continuous sequence of models, such that for every* $\varepsilon < \alpha^*$, $M_{\varepsilon+1}$ *is decomposable over* M_ε*. Then* M_{α^*} *is decomposable over* M_0*.*

Proof. Easy. $\dashv$

3.3. **A disjoint amalgamation.** The following goal is to prove the existence of a disjoint amalgamation. For this we are going to prove the density of the reduced triples.

Definition 3.11. The amalgamation f_1, f_2, M_3 of M_1, M_2 over M_0 is said to be *disjoint* when $f_1[M_1] \bigcap f_2[M_2] = M_0$.

Definition 3.12. The triple $(M,N,a) \in K^{3,bs}_\lambda$ is *reduced* if $(M,N,a) \preceq_{bs} (M^*,N^*,a) \Rightarrow M^* \bigcap N = M$. We define $K^{3,r} := \{(M,N,a) \in K^{3,bs} : (M,N,a) \text{ is reduced}\}$.

Proposition 3.13. *The reduced triples are dense with respect to* $\preceq_{bs}$*: For every* $(M,N,a) \in K^{3,bs}_\lambda$ *there is a reduced triple* (M^*,N^*,a) *which is* $\preceq_{bs}$*-bigger than it.*

Proof. Suppose towards contradiction that over (M,N,a) there is no reduced triple. We will construct models M_α, N_α by induction on $\alpha < \lambda^+$ such that:

(i) $(M_0,N_0,a) = (M,N,a)$.
(ii) For every $\alpha \in \lambda^+$, $(M_\alpha,N_\alpha,a) \preceq_{bs} (M_{\alpha+1},N_{\alpha+1},a)$.
(iii) For every $\alpha \in \lambda^+$, $M_{\alpha+1} \bigcap N_\alpha \neq M_\alpha$.
(iv) The sequence $\langle (M_\alpha,N_\alpha,a) : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ is continuous, (see Definition 3.2 on page 22).

Why can we carry out the construction? For $\alpha = 0$ see clause (i) of the construction. For limit α see clause (iv). Suppose we have defined $\langle M_\beta, N_\beta, a) : \beta \leq \alpha \rangle$. By Proposition 3.3 $(K^{3,bs}, \preceq_{bs})$ is closed under increasing union. So by clauses (i),(ii),(iv) $(M,N,a) \preceq_{bs} (M_\alpha,N_\alpha,a)$. So by the assumption (M_α,N_α,a) is not a reduced triple, i.e. there are $M_{\alpha+1}, N_{\alpha+1}$ which satisfies clauses (ii),(iii). Hence we can carry out this construction.

Now we have:

1. The sequences $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$, $\langle N_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ are increasing (by clause (ii) and the definition of $\preceq_{bs}$).
2. These sequences are continuous (by clause (iv)).
3. For $\alpha \in \lambda^+$, $M_\alpha \subseteq N_\alpha$ (by the definition of $K^{3,bs}$).
4. For every $\alpha \in \lambda^+$, $M_{\alpha+1} \bigcap N_\alpha \neq M_\alpha$ (by clause (iii)).

We got a contradiction to Proposition 1.31. $\dashv$

Theorem 3.14 (The disjoint amalgamation existence theorem)**.** *Assume that:*

(1) *$\mathfrak{s}$ has conjugation.*
(2) *$M_0, M_1, M_2 \in K_\lambda$, $M_0 \preceq M_1$ and $M_0 \preceq M_2$.*

Then there are M_3, f such that $f : M_2 \to M_3$ is an embedding over M_0, $M_1 \preceq M_3$, and $f[M_2] \bigcap M_1 = M_0$. Moreover if $a \in M_1 - M_0$ and $tp(a, M_0, M_1) \in S^{bs}(M_0)$ then we can add that $tp(a, f[M_2], M_3)$ does not fork over M_0.

Proof. If $M_1 = M_0$ then the theorem is trivial. Otherwise by the density of basic types (see Definition 2.1, page 11) there is an element $a \in M_1 - M_0$ such that $tp(a, M_0, M_1) \in S^{bs}(M_0)$. So it is sufficient to prove the "moreover". By Proposition 3.13 the reduced triples are dense with respect to $\preceq_{bs}$. So by Theorem 3.8 (the extensions decomposition theorem), as $\mathfrak{s}$ has conjugation, there is a model M_1^* such that $M_1 \preceq M_1^*$ and M_1^* is decomposable over M_1 by reduced triples, i.e. there is an increasing continuous sequence $\langle N_{0,\alpha} : \alpha \leq \delta \rangle$ of models in K_λ such that: $N_{0,0} = M_0$, $M_{0,\delta} = M_1^*$ and there is a sequence $\langle d_\alpha : \alpha < \delta \rangle$ such that $(N_{0,\alpha}, N_{0,\alpha+1}, d_\alpha)$ is a reduced triple and $d_0 = a$. By Proposition 3.4.1 there is an isomorphism f of M_2 over M_0 and there is an increasing continuous sequence $\langle N_{1,\alpha} : \alpha \leq \delta \rangle$ such that: $N_{0,\alpha} \preceq N_{1,\alpha}$, $f[M_2] = N_{1,0}$ and $tp(d_\alpha, N_{1,\alpha}, N_{1,\alpha+1})$ does not fork over $N_{0,\alpha}$. So for $\alpha < \delta$, $(N_{0,\alpha}, N_{0,\alpha+1}, d_\alpha) \preceq_{bs} (N_{1,\alpha}, N_{1,\alpha+1}, d_\alpha)$. But the triple $(N_{0,\alpha}, N_{0,\alpha+1}, d_\alpha)$ is reduced, so $N_{1,\alpha} \bigcap N_{0,\alpha+1} = N_{0,\alpha}$. Hence $N_{1,0} \bigcap N_{0,\delta} = N_{0,0}$ [Why? let $x \in N_{1,0} \bigcap N_{0,\delta}$. Let α be the first ordinal such that $x \in N_{0,\alpha}$. α cannot be a limit ordinal as the sequence is continuous. If $\alpha = \beta + 1$ then $x \in N_{0,\alpha} \bigcap N_{1,\beta} = N_{0,\beta}$, in contradiction to the definition of α as the first such an ordinal. So we must have $\alpha = 0$, i.e. $x \in N_{0,0}$]. Hence $M_1 \bigcap f[M_2] = N_{0,0} = N_0$. Denote $M_3 = N_{0,\delta}$. $\dashv$

4. Uniqueness triples

Hypothesis 4.1. $\mathfrak{s}$ is a semi-good λ-frame.

Definition 4.2. Suppose

(1) $M_0, M_1, M_2 \in K_\lambda$, $M_0 \preceq M_1 \wedge M_0 \preceq M_2$.
(2) For $x = a, b$, (f_1^x, f_2^x, M_3^x) is an amalgamation of M_1, M_2 over M_0.

$(f_1^a, f_2^a, M_3^a), (f_1^b, f_2^b, M_3^b)$ are said to be *equivalent* over M_0 if there are f^a, f^b, M_3 such that $f^b \circ f_1^b = f^a \circ f_1^a$ and $f^b \circ f_2^b = f^a \circ f_2^a$, namely the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
& M_3^b \arrow[r, "f^b"] & M_3 \\
M_1 \arrow[ur, "f_1^b"] \arrow[rr, "f_1^a"] & & M_3^a \arrow[u, "f^a"'] \\
M_0 \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"'] & M_2 \arrow[uu, "f_2^b"] \arrow[ur, "f_2^a"'] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

We denote the relation 'to be equivalent over M_0' between amalgamations over M_0, by E_{M_0}.

Proposition 4.3. *The relation E_{M_0} is an equivalence relation.*

Proof. Assume $(f_1^a,f_2^a,M_3^a)E_{M_0}(f_1^b,f_2^b,M_3^b)$ and $(f_1^b,f_2^b,M_3^b)E_{M_0}(f_1^c,f_2^c,M_3^c)$. We have to prove that $(f_1^a,f_2^a,M_3^a)E_{M_0}(f_1^c,f_2^c,M_3^c)$. Take witnesses g_1,g_2, $M_3^{a,b}$ for $(f_1^a,f_2^a,M_3^a)E_{M_0}(f_1^b,f_2^b,M_3^b)$, and witnesses $g_3,g_4,M_3^{b,c}$ for $(f_1^b,f_2^b,$ $M_3^b)E_{M_0}(f_1^c,f_2^c,M_3^c)$. Take an amalgamation (h_1,h_2,M_3) of $M_3^{a,b}$ and $M_3^{b,c}$ over M_3^b. Now we will prove that $h_2\circ g_4,h_1\circ g_1,M_3$ witness that that $(f_1^a,f_2^a,M_3^a)E_{M_0}(f_1^c,f_2^c,M_3^c)$, i.e. to prove that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
& M_3^c \arrow[r, "h_2\circ g_4"] & M_3 \\
M_1 \arrow[ur, "f_1^c"] \arrow[rr, "f_1^a"] & & M_3^a \arrow[u, "h_1\circ g_1"'] \\
M_0 \arrow[u, "id_{M_0}"] \arrow[r, "id_{M_0}"'] & M_2 \arrow[uu, "f_2^c"] \arrow[ur, "f_2^a"'] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

i.e. to prove that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
& M_3^c \arrow[r, "g_4"] & M_3^{b,c} \arrow[r, "h_2"] & M_3 \\
& & M_3^b \arrow[u, "g_3"] \arrow[r, "g_2"] & M_3^{a,b} \arrow[u, "h_1"'] \\
M_1 \arrow[uur, "f_1^c"] \arrow[urr, "f_1^b"] \arrow[rrr, "f_1^a"] & & & M_3^a \arrow[u, "g_1"'] \\
M_0 \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_2 \arrow[uuu, "f_2^c"] \arrow[uur, "f_2^b"] \arrow[urr, "f_2^a"] & &
\end{tikzcd}$$

$(h_2\circ g_4)\circ f_2^c=h_2\circ g_3\circ f_2^b=h_1\circ g_2\circ f_2^b=(h_1\circ g_1)\circ f_2^a$ and similarly $(h_2\circ g_4)\circ f_1^c=(h_1\circ g_1)\circ f_1^a$. ⊣

Definition 4.4. $K^{3,uq} = K^{3,uq}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ is the class of triples $(M_0, N_1, a) \in K^{3,bs}$ such that if $M_0 \preceq N_1 \in K_\lambda$ then up to equivalence over M_0 there is a unique amalgamation (f_1, f_2, N_1) of M_1, N_0 over M_0 such that $tp(f_1(a), f_2[N_0], N_1)$ does not fork over M_0. Equivalently, if for $n = 1, 2$ $(M, N, a) \preceq_{bs} (M^*_n, N^*_n, a)$ and $f : M^*_1 \to M^*_2$ is an isomorphism over M, then for some f_1, f_2, N^* the following hold: $f_n : N^*_n \to N^*$ is an embedding over N, and $f_1 \restriction M^*_1 = f_2 \restriction M^*_2 \circ f$.A *uniqueness triple* is a triple in $K^{3,uq}$.

Proposition 4.5.

1. *If p_0, p_1 are conjugate types and in p_0 there is a uniqueness triple, then also in p_1 there is such a triple.*
2. *If $\mathfrak{s}$ has conjugation, then every uniqueness triple is reduced.*

Proof.

1. Suppose $p_0 = tp(a, M, N)$, $(M, N, a) \in K^{3,uq}$. Let f be an isomorphism with domain M, such that $f(p_0) = p_1$. $K, \preceq$ are closed under isomorphisms, so it is easy to prove that $(f[M], f^+[N], f^+(a)) \in K^{3,uq}$, where $f \subseteq f^+$, $dom(f^+) = N$. But $(f[M], f^+[N], f^+(a)) \in p_1$.
2. Suppose $(M_0, N_0, a) \in K^{3,uq}$ and $(M_0, N_0, a) \preceq_{bs} (M_1, N_1, a)$. By Theorem 3.14 (the existence of a disjoint amalgamation), there are f, N_2 such that $f : M_1 \to N_2$ is an embedding over M_0, $N_0 \preceq N_2$, $f[M_1] \bigcap N_0 = M_0$ and $tp(a, f[M_1], N_2)$ does not fork over M_0. By Definition 4.4, there are f_1, f_2, N^* such that: $f_n : N_n \to N^*$ and embedding over N_0 and $f_1 \restriction M_1 = f_2 \circ f$. Let $x \in M_1 - M_0$. Then $x \notin N_0$ [Why? otherwise $f(x) \in f[M_1] - M_0$, so $f(x) \notin N_0$, so $f_1(x) = f_2(f(x)) \notin N_0$ and hence $x \notin N_0$].

$\dashv$

Definition 4.6. Let $\mathfrak{s}$ be a semi good λ-frame.

1. $\mathfrak{s}$ is *weakly successful in the sense of density*, if $K^{3,uq}$ is dense with respect to $\preceq_{bs}$.
2. $\mathfrak{s}$ is *weakly successful* if $K^{3,uq}$ has existence.

Proposition 4.7.

1. *If $\mathfrak{s}$ is weakly successful in the sense of density and it has conjugation then it is weakly successful.*
2. *Let $\mathfrak{s}$ be weakly successful. If $p = tp(a, M, N) \in S^{bs}(M)$, then there is a model N^* such that $(M, N^*, a) \in K^{3,uq} \bigcap p$.*

Proof.

1. Substitute $K^{3,*} := K^{3,uq}$ in Theorem 3.8.1 (page 26).
2. By Theorem 3.8.2.

$\dashv$

Now the reader can believe that the assumption that $\mathfrak{s}$ is weakly successful is reasonable and jump to section 5 or to read the rest of this section (which is based on [Sh 838]).

Hypothesis 4.8. $\mathfrak{s}$ is (a semi-good λ-frame and) not weakly successful in the sense of density.

Discussion toward defining nice construction frame: Every model $M \in K_{\mu^+}$ can be represented as $\bigcup\{M_\beta : \beta < \mu^+\}$ where each M_β is in K_μ (and the sequence is increasing and continuous). Now we can represent each M_β as $\bigcup\{M_{\alpha,\beta} : \alpha < \mu\}$ where each $M_{\alpha,\beta}$ is in $K_{<\mu}$. So we can approximate a model M in K_{μ^+} by a "rectangle" $\{M_{\alpha,\beta} : \alpha < \mu, \beta < \mu^+\}$ of models in $K_{<\mu}$, where $\langle M_{\alpha,\beta} : \alpha < \beta\rangle$ is an increasing continuous sequence of models in $K_{<\mu}$, $\langle\bigcup\{M_{\alpha,\beta} : \alpha < \mu\} : \beta < \mu^+\rangle$ is an increasing continuous sequence of models in K_μ and $\bigcup\{M_{\alpha,\beta} : \alpha < \mu, \beta < \mu^+\} = M$.

Now we want to violate this rectangle. For $n = 1, 2$ we will define a relation FR_n such that $(\forall\alpha,\beta)[(M_{\alpha,\beta}, M_{\alpha+1,\beta}, I_{\alpha,\beta}) \in FR_1 \wedge (M_{\alpha,\beta}, M_{\alpha,\beta+1}, J_{\alpha,\beta}) \in FR_2$, where $I_{\alpha,\beta}$ and $J_{\alpha,\beta}$ are witnesses for the extensions, namely $I_{\alpha,\beta} \subset M_{\alpha+1,\beta} - M_{\alpha,\beta}$ and $J_{\alpha,\beta} \subset M_{\alpha,\beta+1} - M_{\alpha,\beta}$. So essentially, FR_n is a relation on extensions.

We have to violate also the pairs of such pairs, i.e. $((M_{\alpha,\beta}, M_{\alpha+1,\beta}), (M_{\alpha,\beta+1}, M_{\alpha+1,\beta+1}))$. In other words, we have to define 2-dimensional relations $\leq_1, \leq_2$ on FR_1, FR_2 respectively.

Definition 4.9. $U = (\mu, k^u, FR_1, FR_2, \leq_1, \leq_2)$ is a nice construction frame if:

1. $\aleph_0 < \mu$ is a regular cardinal.
2. $k^U = (K^U, \preceq^U)$ is an a.e.c. in $< \mu$. The vocabulary of K^U will denoted τ^U.
3. For $n = 1, 2$ FR^n is a class of triples (M, N, J) such that:
   - (a) $M, N \in K^U,\ M \preceq^U N,\ J \subseteq N - M$.
   - (b) For every $M \in K^U$ there are N, J such that: $J \neq \emptyset$ and $(M, N, J) \in FR_n$.
   - (c) If $M \preceq^U N$, then $(M, N, \emptyset) \in FR_n$.
4. "$(FR_n, \leq_n)$ satisfies some axioms of a.e.c. and disjointness":
   - (a) $\leq_n$ is an order relation of FR_n.
   - (b) The relations $FR_n, \leq_n$ are closed under isomorphisms.
   - (c) If $(M_{0,0}, M_{0,1}, J_0) \leq_n (M_{1,0}, M_{1,1}, J_1)$ then $(n_1 \leq n_2 < 2 \wedge m_1 \leq m_2 < 2) \Rightarrow M_{n_1,m_1} \preceq^U M_{n_2,m_2}$ and $M_{1,0} \bigcap M_{0,1} = M_{0,0}$.
   - (d) Axiom c of a.e.c.: For every $\delta < \mu$ and an $\leq_n$-increasing continuous sequence $\langle(M^\alpha, N^\alpha, J^\alpha) : \alpha < \delta\rangle$ we have $(M^0, N^0, J^0) \leq_n (\bigcup\{M^\alpha : \alpha < \delta\}, \bigcup\{N^\alpha : \alpha < \delta\}, \bigcup\{J^\alpha : \alpha < \delta\ \})$.
5. U has disjoint amalgamation (at first glance one can think that the disjointness is in the assumption, but it is in the conclusion, see 4c): If $(M_0, M_1, J_1) \in FR_1$, $(M_0, M_2, J_2) \in FR_2$ and $M_1 \bigcap M_2 = M_0$

then there are M_3, J_1^*, J_2^* such that for $n = 1, 2$ $M_n \preceq^U M_3$ and $(M_0, M_n, J_n) \leq_n (M_{3-n}, M_3, J_n^*)$.

A way to force an amalgamation to be disjoint, is to replace the equality relation by an equivalence one. This is the role of E in the following definition.

Definition 4.10. Let U be a nice construction frame. Let $(K, \preceq)$ be an a.e.c. with a vocabulary τ, such that $\tau \subseteq \tau^U$ and there is a 2-place predicate $E \in \tau^U - \tau$ (in the main case $\tau^U = \tau \bigcup \{E\}$), such that for $M \in K^U$ we have:

1. E^M is an equivalence relation.
2. If R is a predicate in τ^U different from $=$ and xE^My then $R^M(x_0, ..., x_{i-1}, x, x_{i+1}, ...x_n)$ iff $R^M(x_0, ..., x_{i-1}, y, x_{i+1}, ...x_n)$.

Similarly for function symbols.
We write $(K, \preceq) = (U/E)^\tau$ when:
$(K, \preceq)$ is an a.e.c. and $K_{<\mu} = \{N : (\exists M \in K^U)(N = M/E)\}$, where M/E is defined by the following way: Its world is the set of equivalence classes of E^M, its vocabulary is τ and it interprets the predicates and function symbols by representatives of the equivalence classes.

Now we are going to define approximations of cardinality μ, by the approximations of cardinality $< \mu$.

Definition 4.11.

1. $K^{qt} = K^{qt,U} := \{(\bar{M}, \bar{J}, f) : \bar{M} = \langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \mu\rangle, \bar{J} = \langle J_\alpha : \alpha < \mu\rangle, f \in^\mu \mu, \alpha < \mu \Rightarrow (M_\alpha, M_{\alpha+1}, J_\alpha) \in FR_2\}$ (f plays a role in the relation $\leq^{qt}$).
2. $\leq^{qt}$ is a relation on K^{qt}. $(M_0, J_0, f_0) \leq (M_1, J_1, f_1)$ iff there is a club E of μ such that for every $\delta \in E$ and $\alpha \leq f^1(\delta)$ we have:
   (a) $f^1(\delta) \leq f^2(\delta)$.
   (b) $M_{0,\delta+1} \leq M_{1,\delta+1}$.
   (c) $(M_{0,\delta+\alpha}, M_{0,\delta+\alpha+1}, J_{0,\delta+\alpha}) \leq_2 (M_{1,\delta+\alpha}, M_{1,\delta+\alpha+1}, J_{1,\delta+\alpha})$.
   (d) $M_{1,\delta+\alpha} \bigcap \bigcup \{M_{0,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \mu\} = M_{0,\delta+\alpha}$.

Definition 4.12. We say that *almost every* $(\bar{M}, \bar{J}, f) \in K^{qt}$ satisfies the property *pr* when: There is a function $g : K^{qt} \to K^{qt}$ such that if $\langle \bar{M}^\alpha : \bar{J}^\alpha, f^\alpha\rangle$ is an $\leq^{qt}$-increasing continuous (in the sense which is defined in [Sh 838] and not here) and $sup\{\alpha \in \delta : g((\bar{M}^\alpha, \bar{J}^\alpha, f^\alpha)) = (\bar{M}^{\alpha+1}, \bar{J}^{\alpha+1}, f^{\alpha+1})\} = \delta)$, then $(\bar{M}^\delta, \bar{J}^\delta, f^\delta) \in pr$.

Definition 4.13.

1. Let U be a nice construction frame. We say that U satisfies the *weak coding property* for $(K, \preceq)$ if almost every $(\bar{M}, \bar{J}, f) \in K^{qt}$ satisfies the weak coding property.
2. We say that $(\bar{M}, \bar{J}, f) \in K^{qt}$ satisfies the *weak coding property* when: There are $\alpha_0 < \mu$ and N_0, J_0 such that $(M_{\alpha_0}, N_0, J_0) \in$

FR_1, $N_0 \bigcap M = M_{\alpha_0}$ where $M := \bigcup\{M_\alpha : \alpha < \mu\}$, and there is a club E of μ such that for every $\alpha_1 \in E$ and every N_1, J_1, which satisfy $(M_{\alpha_0}, N_0, J_0) \leq_1 (M_{\alpha_1}, N_1, J_1) \wedge N_1 \bigcap M = M_{\alpha_1}$, there is $\alpha_2 \in (\alpha_1, \mu)$ and for $n = 1, 2$ there are $N_{2,n}, J_{2,n}$ such that:

(a) $(M_{\alpha_1}, N_1, J_1) \leq_1 (M_{\alpha_2}, N_{2,n}, J_{2,n})$.

(b) $N_{2,1}, N_{2,2}$ are incomparable amalgamations of M_{α_2}, N_1 over M_{α_1}, i.e. there are no N, f_1, f_2 such that f_n is an embedding of $N_{2,n}$ into N over $N_1 \bigcup M_{\alpha_2}$.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & & N_{2,2} & \\
N_0 \arrow[r, "id"] & N_1 \arrow[ur, "id"] \arrow[rr, "id"] & & N_{2,1} \\
M_{\alpha(0)} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_{\alpha(1)} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_{\alpha(2)} \arrow[uu, "id"] \arrow[ur, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M
\end{tikzcd}$$

Definition 4.14. $\mu_{unif}(\mu^+, 2^\mu) := Min\{|P| : P$ is a family of subsets of ${}^{\mu^+}(2^\mu)$ with union ${}^{\mu^+}(2^\mu)$ and for each $A \in P$ there is a function c with domain $\bigcup\{{}^{\alpha}(2^\mu) : \alpha < \mu^+\}$ such that for each $f \in A$, the set $\{\delta \in \mu^+ : c(f \restriction \delta) = f(\delta)\}$ is not stationary$\}$.

Proposition 4.15. $\mu_{unif} \leq 2^{\mu^+}$.

Proof. Easy. $\dashv$

Remark 4.16. $\mu_{unif}(\mu^+, 2^\mu)$ is "almost 2^{μ^+}": If $\beth_\omega \leq \mu$, then $\mu_{unif}(\mu^+, 2^\mu) = 2^{\mu^+}$, and in any case it is not clear if $\mu_{unif}(\mu^+, 2^\mu) < 2^{\mu^+}$ is consistent. There are propositions which say that it is "a big cardinal".

The following theorem is written in [Sh 838], and we bring it without a proof.

Theorem 4.17. *Let U be a nice construction frame which satisfies the weak coding property for $(K, \preceq)$. Suppose the following set theoretical assumptions:*

(1) $2^\theta = 2^{<\mu} < 2^\mu$.

(2) $2^\mu < 2^{\mu^+}$.

(3) The ideal $WdmId(\mu)$ is not saturated in μ^+.

Then $\mu_{unif}(\mu^+, 2^\mu) \leq I(\mu^+, K)$, where $I(\mu^+, K)$ is the number of non-isomorphic models in K_{μ^+}.

Now we are going to study a specific nice construction frame. From now $(K, \preceq)$ will denote the a.e.c. of $\mathfrak{s}$.

Definition 4.18. Define $U = (\mu, (K^u, \preceq^u), FR_1, FR_2, \leq_1, \leq_2)$:

(1) $\mu = \lambda^+$.

(2) The vocabulary of K^U is $\tau^U := \tau \bigcup \{E\}$ where E is a new predicate.
(3) $K^U := \{M : ||M|| = \lambda,\ M/E \in K_\lambda\}$. ($M/E$ is well defined only if E^M is a congruence relation on $|M|$, see Definition 4.10. So if not, then M does not belong to K^U).
(4) $\preceq^U := \{(M, N) : M/E \preceq N/E \wedge M \subseteq N\}$.
(5) $FR_n := \{(M, N, J) : M, N \in K^U,\ J \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow (\exists a)[J = \{a\} \wedge (M/E, N/E, a/E) \in K^{3,bs}]\}$.
(6) For $n = 1, 2$ the relation $\leq_n$ is defined by the relation $\preceq_{bs}$ in the same way we defined FR_n.

Proposition 4.19. *Almost every* $(\bar{M}, \bar{J}, f) \in K^{qt,U}$ *satisfies:* $\bigcup\{M_\alpha/E : \alpha < \lambda^+\}$ *is a saturated model in* λ^+ *over* λ.

Proof. See [Sh 838]. $\dashv$

Theorem 4.20. *If* $\bar{M} = \langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+\rangle$, $\bar{a} = \langle a_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+\rangle$, $(\bar{M}, \bar{a}, f) \in K^{qt}$ *and* $\bigcup\{M_\alpha/E : \alpha < \lambda^+\}$ *is saturated in* λ^+ *over* λ, *then* $(\bar{M}, \bar{a}, f)$ *satisfies the weak coding property.*

Proof. For distinguishing between models in K_λ to models in K^U, we add to the names of models in K_λ subscript e, unless they are written in the form M/E. For example: M_e, $M_{2,e}$. Similarly for isomorphisms.

Lemma 4.21.

(1) *Let* $N_0 \in K^U$, $N_{1,e} \in K_\lambda$ *be such that* $N_0/E \preceq N_{1,e}$. *Then there is* $N_1 \in K^U$ *such that:*
  (a) $N_1/E = N_{1,e}$.
  (b) $N_0 \preceq^U N_1$.
  (c) N_1 *is embedded in every model which satisfies 1,2.*
  In this case we call N_1 *the canonical completion of* $N_0, N_{1,e}$. *There is exactly one such a model up to isomorphism. Clearly every* $[x] \in N_1 - N_0$ *is a singleton.*
(2) *Suppose:*
  (a) $N_0 \preceq^U N_1$, $N_0 \preceq^U N_2$.
  (b) $g_e : N_1/E \to N_2/E$ *is an embedding over* N_0/E.
  (c) N_1 *is the canonical completion of* $N_1/E, N_0$.
  Then there is an embedding $g : N_1 \to N_2$ *over* N_0 *such that* $(\forall x \in N_1)(g(x) \in [g_e(x/E)])$.
(3) *Suppose for* $n < 3$, $N_n \in K^U$, $N_0/E \preceq N_n/E \preceq N_{3,e} \in K_\lambda$ *and* $N_1 \bigcap N_2 = N_0$. *Then there is* $N_3 \in K^U$ *such that* $N_3/E = N_{3,e}$ *and for* $n = 1, 2$ $N_n \preceq N_3$.

Proof.

(1) Trivial.
(2) Use the axiom of choice [For $x \in N_1 - N_0$ $g(x)$ choose an arbitrary element in $g_e([x])$].
(3) Trivial.

$\dashv$

Now we prove that $(\bar{M}, \bar{a}, f)$ satisfies the weak coding property, by the following steps:

Step a: Denote $\alpha(0) = 0$. $M_0/E \in K_\lambda$. So by the categoricity in K_λ and non-weak successfulness, there are $N_{0,e} \in K_\lambda$ and $a \in N_{0,e}$ such that $(M_0/E, N_{0,e}, a) \in K^{3,bs}$ and every triple which is $\preceq_{bs}$-bigger from it is not a uniqueness triple. Without lose of generality $N_{0,e} \bigcap M/E = M_0/E$. Let $N_0 \in K^U$ be the model with world $N_{0,e}$, E^{N_0} is the equality, and $N_0/E = N_{0,e}$. λ^+ is of course a club of λ^+. Let $\alpha(1) \in (\alpha(0), \mu)$, and let $N_1 \in K^U$ such that $N_1 \bigcap M = M_{\alpha(1)}$, $(M_0, N_0, a) \leq_n (M_{\alpha(1)}, N_1, a)$. We have to find $\alpha(2)$.

Step b: $(M_{\alpha(1)}/E, N_1/E, a)$ is not a uniqueness triple. So for $n < 2$ there are $M_{2,n,e}, N^*_{2,n,e} \in K_\lambda$ and an isomorphism $g_e : M_{2,0,e} \to M_{2,1,e}$ over $M_{\alpha(1)}/E$ such that $(M_{\alpha(1)}/E, N_1/E, a) \preceq_{bs} (M_{2,n,e}, N^*_{2,n,e}, a)$ and there are no $g_{0,e}, g_{1,e}, N_{3,e}$ such that $g_{n,e} : N^*_{2,n,e} \to N_{3,e} \in K_\lambda$ an embedding over N_1/E and $g_{1,e} \circ g_e = g_{0,e}$. We choose new elements for $N^*_{2,n,e} - (M_{\alpha(1)}/E)$, i.e. without loss of generality $M/E \bigcap N^*_{2,n,e} = M_{\alpha(1)}/E$. By item 1 in the lemma for $n < 2$ there is a model $M_{2,n}$ which is canonical over $M_{\alpha(1)}, M_{2,n,e}$. By item 3 of the lemma for $n < 2$ there is a model $N^*_{2,n} \in K^U$ such that $M_{2,n} \preceq^U N^*_{2,n}$, $N_1 \preceq N^*_{2,n}$ and $N^*_{2,n}/E = N^*_{2,n,e}$.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
N_0 \arrow[r, "id"] & N_1 \arrow[r, "id"] & N^*_{2,n,e} \\
M_0 \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_{\alpha(1)} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_{2,n,e} \arrow[u, "id"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

Step c: M/E is saturated in λ^+ over λ, so by Lemma 1.32 (the saturation = model homogeneity lemma), there is an embedding $f_{0,e} : M_{2,0,e} \to M/E$ over $M_{\alpha(1)}/E$. So by item b of the lemma over, there is an embedding $f_0 : M_{2,0} \to M$ over $M_{\alpha(1)}$. Define $f_1 = f_0 \circ g_e^{-1}$. Now for $n < 2$ the function $f_n : M_{2,n} \to M$ is an embedding.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
& N_{3,e} & \\
M_{2,0,e} \arrow[ur, "g_{0,e}"] \arrow[rr, "g_e"] & & M_{2,1,e} \arrow[ul, "g_{1,e}"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

Step d: For $n < 2$ let h_n be a function with domain $N^*_{2,n}$ that extends f_n by the identity. So $h_n \restriction N_1$ is the identity.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
N_1 \arrow[r, "id"] & h_n[N^*_{2,n}] & \\
M_{\alpha(1)} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & f_n[M_{2,n}] \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M
\end{tikzcd}$$

Step e: Define $\alpha(2) := \mathrm{Min}\{\alpha \in \lambda^+ : f_0[M_{2,0}] \preceq M_{\alpha(2)}\}$.
Step f: For $n < 2$ we can choose a model $N_{2,n} \in K^U$ such that $(f_n[M_{2,n}], h_n[N^*_{2,n}], a) \preceq_1 (M_{\alpha(2)}, N_{2,n}, a)$.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
N_1 \arrow[r, "id"] & h_n[N^*_{2,n}] \arrow[r, "id"] & N_{2,n} \\
M_{\alpha(1)} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & f_0[M_{2,0}] \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_{\alpha(2)} \arrow[u, "id"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

By the transitivity of the relation $\leq_1$, we have $(M_{\alpha(1)}, N_1, a) \leq_1 (M_{\alpha(2)}, N_{2,n}, a)$.
Step g: $N_{2,0}, N_{2,1}$ witness that $\alpha(2)$ is as required [Toward contradiction assume that there are $N_{3,e} \in K_\lambda$ and embeddings $g_{0,e}, g_{1,e}$ such that $g_n : N_{2,n}/E \to N_3$ is an embedding over $M_{\alpha(2)}/E \bigcup N_1/E$ Define an isomorphism $g^*_{n,e} : N^*_{2,n,e} \to N_{3,e}$ by $g^*_{n,e}(x) := g_{n,e}([h_n(x)])$. This is an embedding over N_1/E and it includes $f_{n,e}$. This contradict the way we chose $M_{2,n,e}, N^*_{2,n,e}$ in step b]. Hence the triple $(\bar{M}, \bar{a}, f)$ satisfies the weak coding property. $\dashv$

Corollary 4.22. *U satisfies the weak coding property.*

Proof. By 4.19,4.20. $\dashv$

Corollary 4.23. *Let $\mathfrak{s}$ be a semi-good λ-frame which is not weakly successful in the sense of density. Then $I(\lambda^{+2}, K) \geq \mu_{unif}(\lambda^{+2}, 2^{\lambda^+})$.*

Proof. By 4.17,4.22. $\dashv$

5. Non-forking amalgamation

Hypothesis 5.1. $\mathfrak{s}$ is a weakly successful semi-good λ-frame with conjugation, but we do not use local character in this section.

5.1. **The axioms of non-forking amalgamation.**

Introduction: We want to find a relation of a canonical amalgamation (see the discussion in the beginning of section 3). In Definition 5.2 we define the properties this relation has to satisfy.

Definition 5.2. Let $NF \subseteq {}^4(K_\lambda)$ be a relation. We say $\bigotimes_{NF}$ when the following axioms are satisfied:

(a) If $NF(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$ *then* $n \in \{1, 2\} \Rightarrow M_0 \preceq M_n \preceq M_3$ *and* $M_1 \cap M_2 = M_0$.
(b) Monotonicity: If $NF(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$ *and* $N_0 = M_0, n < 3 \Rightarrow N_n \preceq M_n \wedge N_0 \preceq N_n \preceq N_3, (\exists N^*)[M_3 \preceq N^* \wedge N_3 \preceq N^*]$ *then* $NF(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3)$.
(c) Existence: For every $N_0, N_1, N_2 \in K_\lambda$ if $l \in \{1, 2\} \Rightarrow N_0 \preceq N_l$ and $N_1 \bigcap N_2 = N_0$ then there is N_3 such that $NF(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3)$.

(d) Weak uniqueness: Suppose for $x = a, b$ $NF(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3^x)$. Then there is a joint embedding of N_3^a, N_3^b over $N_1 \bigcup N_2$.
(e) Symmetry: $NF(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3) \Leftrightarrow NF(N_0, N_2, N_1, N_3)$.
(f) Long transitivity: For $x = a, b$ let $\langle M_{x,i} : i \leq \alpha^* \rangle$ an increasing continuous sequence of models in K_λ. Suppose $i < \alpha^* \Rightarrow NF(M_{a,i}, M_{a,i+1}, M_{b,i}, M_{b,i+1})$. Then $NF(M_{a,0}, M_{a,\alpha^*}, M_{b,0}, M_{b,\alpha^*})$

We give another version of weak uniqueness:

Proposition 5.3. *Suppose*

(1) $\bigotimes_{NF}$.
(2) $NF(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$ *and* $NF(M_0, M_1^*, M_2^*, M_3^*)$.
(3) For $n = 1, 2$ *there is an isomorphism* $f_n : M_n \to M_n^*$ *over* M_0.

Then there are M, f *such that:*

(1) For $n < 3$ $f \restriction M_n = f_n$.
(2) $M_3^* \preceq M$.
(3) $f[M_3] \preceq M$.

Proof. $M_1 \bigcap M_2 = M_0$, so there is a function g with domain M_3 such that $f_1 \bigcup f_2 \subseteq g$. So $g[M_1] = M_1^*$ and $g[M_2] = M_2^*$. Hence $NF(M_0, M_1^*, M_2^*, g[M_3])$ and $NF(M_0, M_1^*, M_2^*, M_3^*)$. Therefore we can use the weak uniqueness in Definition 5.2. ⊣

Roughly speaking the following proposition says that finding a relation NF that satisfies clauses a,c,d of Definition 5.2 is equivalent to assigning to each triple $(M_0, M_1, M_2) \in D := \{(M_0, M_1, M_2) : M_0, M_1, M_2 \in K_\lambda,\ M_0 \preceq M_1, M_0 \preceq M_2\}$ a disjoint amalgamation (see Definition 3.11) (f_1, f_2, M_3) of M_1, M_2 over M_0 up to E_{M_0} (see Definition 4.2.

Proposition 5.4. *Let* NF *be a relation that satisfies clauses a,c,d of Definition 5.2. Then:*

(1) There is a function G *with domain* $D := \{(M_0, M_1, M_2) : M_0, M_1, M_2 \in K_\lambda,\ M_0 \preceq M_1, M_0 \preceq M_2\}$ *which assign to each triple* (M_0, M_1, M_2) *an amalgamation* (f_1, f_2, M_3) *of* M_1, M_2 *over* M_0*, such that* $NF(M_0, f_1[M_1], f_2[M_2], M_3)$ *(in this item we do not use clause d).*
(2) If G_1, G_2 *are two functions as in item 1 (with respect to* NF*), then for every* $(M_0, M_1, M_2) \in D$, $G_1((M_0, M_1, M_2)) E_{M_0} G_2((M_0, M_1, M_2))$.
(3) If G *is a function with domain* $D := \{(M_0, M_1, M_2) : M_1, M_1, M_2 \in K_\lambda,\ M_0 \preceq M_1, M_0 \preceq M_2\}$ *which assign to each triple* (M_0, M_1, M_2) *a disjoint amalgamation, then the relation* $R := \{(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3) : M_1 \bigcap M_2 = M_0,\ G((M_0, M_1, M_2)) E_{M_0} (id_{M_1}, id_{M_2}, M_3)\}$ *satisfies clauses a,c,d of Definition 5.2.*

Proof. We leave to the reader. ⊣

Definition 5.5. Suppose $\bigotimes_{NF}$. NF is said to *respect the frame* $\mathfrak{s}$ when: if $NF(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$ and $tp(a, M_0, M_1) \in S^{bs}(M_0)$ then $tp(a, M_2, M_3)$ does not fork over M_0.

5.2. **The relation NF.** First we define a relation NF^* and then we define a relation NF as its monotonicity closure. Theorem 5.27 asserts that the relation NF is the unique relation which satisfies $\bigotimes_{NF}$ and respects the frame $\mathfrak{s}$.

Definition 5.6. Define a relation $NF^* = NF^*_\lambda$ on ${}^4(K_\lambda)$ by: $NF^*(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3)$ if there is $\alpha^* < \lambda^+$ and for l=1,2 there are an increasing continuous sequence $\langle N_{l,i} : i \leq \alpha^* \rangle$ and a sequence $\langle d_i : i < \alpha^* \rangle$ such that:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
N_2 = N_{2,0} \arrow[r, "id"] & N_{2,i} \arrow[r, "id"] & N_{2,i+1} \arrow[r, "id"] & N_{2,\alpha^*} = N_3 \\
N_0 = N_{1,0} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & N_{1,i} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & N_{1,i+1} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & N_{1,\alpha^*} = N_1 \arrow[u, "id"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

(a) $n < 3 \Rightarrow N_0 \preceq N_n \preceq N_3$.
(b) $N_{1,0} = N_0, N_{1,\alpha^*} = N_1, N_{2,0} = N_2, N_{2,\alpha^*} = N_3$.
(c) $i \leq \alpha^* \Rightarrow N_{1,i} \preceq N_{2,i}$.
(d) $d_i \in N_{1,i+1} - N_{1,i}$.
(e) $(N_{1,i}, N_{1,i+1}, d_i) \in K^{3,uq}$.
(f) $tp(d_i, N_{2,i}, N_{2,i+1})$ does not fork over $N_{1,i}$.

In this case, $\langle N_{1,i}, d_i : i < \alpha^* \rangle ^\frown \langle N_{1,\alpha^*} \rangle$ is said to be the first witness for $NF^*(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3)$, d_i is said to be the i-th element in the first witness for NF^* and $\langle N_{2,i} : i \leq \alpha^* \rangle$ is said to be the second witness for $NF^*(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3)$.

Definition 5.7. $NF = NF_\lambda$ is the class of quadruples (M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3) such that $M_0 \preceq M_1 \preceq M_3$, $M_0 \preceq M_2 \preceq M_3$ and there are models N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3 such that: $N_0 = M_0, l < 4 \Rightarrow M_l \preceq N_l$ and $NF^*(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3)$.

Proposition 5.8. *The relations NF^*, NF are closed under isomorphisms.*

Proof. Trivial. $\dashv$

Proposition 5.9. *Suppose for $x = a, b$ $(f_{x,1}, f_{x,2}, M_{x,3})$ is an amalgamation of M_1, M_2 over M_0. If $(f_{a,1}, f_{a,2}, M_{a,3}) E_{M_0} (f_{b,1}, f_{b,2}, M_{b,3})$, then*

$$NF(M_0, f_{a,1}[M_1], f_{a,2}[M_2], M_{a,3}) \Leftrightarrow NF(M_0, f_{b,1}[M_1], f_{b,2}[M_2], M_{b,3})$$

Proof. Easy. $\dashv$

Proposition 5.10.

(1) Every triple in $K^{3,uq}$ is reduced.
(2) If $NF^*(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3)$ then $N_1 \bigcap N_2 = N_0$.
(3) If $NF(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3)$ then $N_1 \bigcap N_2 = N_0$.

Proof. (1) Suppose $(N_0, N_1, d) \preceq_{bs} (N_2, N_3, d), (N_0, N_1, d) \in K^{3,uq}$. By Hypothesis 5.1 and Proposition 3.14 (page 29) there is a disjoint amalgamation of N_1, N_2 over N_0, such that the type of d does not fork over N_0, so by the definition of uniqueness triple (definition 4.4), N_3 is a disjoint amalgamation of N_1, N_2 over N_0.

(2) Let $x \in N_1 \bigcap N_2$. We will prove that $x \in N_0$. Let $\langle N_{1,\alpha}, d_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle ^\frown \langle N_{1,\alpha^*} \rangle, \langle N_{2,\alpha} : \alpha \leq \alpha^* \rangle$ be witnesses for $NF^*(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3)$. Let α be the first ordinal such that $x \in N_{1,\alpha}$. α is not a limit ordinal, because a first witness for NF^* is especially a continuous sequence. we prove that α is not a successor ordinal, so we conclude that $\alpha = 0$. Suppose $\alpha = \beta + 1$. By Definition 5.6.e $(N_{1,\beta}, N_{1,\beta+1}, d_\beta) \in K^{3,uq}$. By Definition 5.6.f $tp(d_\beta, N_{1,\beta}, N_{1,\beta+1})$ does not fork over $N_{0,\beta}$. So by Proposition 5.10.1 $N_{1,\beta+1} \bigcap N_{2,\beta} = N_{1,\beta}$. But $x \in N_{1,\beta+1} \bigcap N_2 \subseteq N_{1,\beta+1} \bigcap N_{2,\beta}$, so $x \in N_{1,\beta}$ in contradiction to the assumption that α is the minimal ordinal with $x \in N_{1,\alpha}$.

(3) By 2. $\dashv$

Theorem 5.11 (the existence theorem for NF)**.** *Suppose that for $n = 1, 2$ $N_0 \preceq N_n$ and $N_1 \bigcap N_2 = N_0$.*

(a) For some model $N_3 \in K_\lambda$ $NF(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3)$.
(b) Moreover, if N_1 is decomposable over N_0 by $K^{3,uq}$ then for some $N_3 \in K_\lambda$ $NF^*(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3)$.
(c) Moreover, letting $a \in N_1 - N_0$ we can choose a as the first element in the first witness for NF^*.

Proof.

(a) By Theorem 3.8.3 (the extensions decomposition theorem, page 26), (and assumption 5.1), there is a model N_1^* with $N_1 \preceq N_1^*$ which is decomposable over N_0, i.e. there is a sequence $\langle N_{1,\alpha}, d_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle ^\frown \langle N_{1,\alpha^*} \rangle$, such that: $N_0 = N_{1,0}, (N_{1,\alpha}, N_{1,\alpha+1}, d_\alpha) \in K^{3,uq}, N_1 \preceq N_{1,\alpha^*} = N_1^*$. Therefore we can use item b.
(b) Let $\langle N_{1,\alpha}, d_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle ^\frown \langle N_{1,\alpha^*} \rangle$ be an increasing continuous sequence with $N_{1,0} = N_0$ and $N_{1,\alpha^*} = N_1$. By Proposition 3.4.1 there is a sequence $\langle N_{2,\alpha} : \alpha \leq \alpha^* \rangle$ which is a corresponding second witness for $NF^*(N_0, N_{1,\alpha^*}, N_2, N_{2,\alpha^*})$.
(c) By the 'more over' in Theorem 3.8.3 (the decomposing extensions theorem, page 26).

$\dashv$

The following theorem is a private case of Theorem 5.25, i.e. the long transitivity theorem.

Proposition 5.12. *For $x = a, b$ let $\langle M_{x,\alpha} : \alpha \leq \alpha^* \rangle$ be an increasing continuous sequence of models. Suppose $\alpha < \alpha^* \Rightarrow NF^*(M_{a,\alpha}, M_{a,\alpha+1}, M_{b,\alpha}, M_{b,\alpha+1})$. Then $NF^*(M_{a,0}, M_{a,\alpha^*}, M_{b,0}, M_{b,\alpha^*})$.*

Proof. Concatenate all the sequences together. $\dashv$

Proposition 5.13 (the monotonicity theorem)**.**

(1) If $NF^*(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3)$ and $N_0 \preceq M_2 \preceq N_2$, then $NF^*(N_0, N_1, M_2, N_3)$.
(2) If $NF(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$ then we can find N_1, N_3 such that $NF^*(M_1, N_1, M_2, N_3)$ and $M_1 \preceq N_1 \preceq N_3 \wedge M_3 \preceq N_3$.

(3) $NF^*(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3) \wedge M_3 \preceq M_3^* \Rightarrow NF(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3^*)$.

(4) The relation NF *satisfies monotonicity (in the sense of Definition 5.2.b).*

Proof.
(1) Let $\langle N_{1,\alpha}, d_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle$, $\langle N_{2,\alpha} : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle$ be witnesses for $NF^*(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3)$. Then $\langle N_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle$, $\langle M_2 \rangle^\frown \langle N_{2,\alpha} : 0 < \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle$ are witnesses for $NF^*(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3)$ (notice that by Definition 2.1.3.b (monotonicity) $tp(d_0, M_2, N_{2,1})$ does not fork over N_0).
(2) By the definition of NF (Definition 5.7) and item 1.
(3)

$$\begin{tikzcd}
a \in M_1^* \arrow[rr, "f"] & & M_3^{**} \\
M_1 \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_3 \arrow[r, "id"] & M_3^* \arrow[u, "id"] \\
M_0 \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_2 \arrow[u, "id"] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Take $p \in S^{bs}(M_1)$, and take M_1^*, a such that $(M_1, M_1^*, a) \in p \bigcap K^{3,uq}$. By Definition 2.1.1.3.f (on page 11) there is an amalgamation $(f, id_{M_3^*}, M_3^{**})$ of M_1^*, M_3^* over M_1 such that $tp(a, f[M_3^*], M_3^{**})$ does not fork over M_1. So $NF^*(M_1, f[M_1^*], M_3^*, M_3^{**})$. Hence by item 1, $NF^*(M_1, f[M_1^*], M_3, M_3^{**})$. Now by Proposition 5.12 $NF^*(M_0, M_1^*, M_2, M_3^{**})$. So the definition of NF (Definition 5.7), $NF(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3^*)$.
(4) Suppose $M_0^* = M_0$, $0 < n < 3 \Rightarrow M_0^* \preceq M_n^* \preceq M_3^*$, $M_n^* \preceq M_n$, $M_3^* \preceq M_3^{**}$, $M_3 \preceq M_3^{**}$, $NF(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & & M_3^{**} \arrow[r, "f"] & M_3^{***} \\
N_1 \arrow[rrr, "id"] & & & N_3 \arrow[u, "id"] \\
M_1 \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[rr, "id"] & & M_3 \arrow[uu, "id"] \arrow[ur, "id"] & \\
M_1^* \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_3^* \arrow[uuur, "id"] & & \\
M_0 \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_2^* \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_2 = N_2 \arrow[uu, "id"] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

By item 2, for some N_1, N_3, $NF^*(M_0, N_1, M_2, N_3)$, $M_1 \preceq N_1 \preceq N_3$ and $M_3 \preceq N_3$. Take an amalgamation (f, id_{N_3}, M_3^{***}) of M_3^{**} and N_3 over M_3 (so over $M_1^* \bigcup M_2^*$). By item 3 $NF(M_0, N_1, M_2, M_3^{***})$. So by the definition of NF (Definition 5.7), $NF(M_0, M_1^*, M_2^*, f[M_3^*])$. But the relation NF is closed under isomorphisms, so $NF(M_0, M_1^*, M_2^*, M_3^*)$. ⊣

5.3. **Weak Uniqueness.** We want to show that NF satisfies weak uniqueness and long transitivity. Proposition 5.17 is a key point. To emphasize the exact hypotheses involved in the proof, we extract from the axioms $\bigotimes_R$, a smaller set $\bigotimes_R^-$.

Definition 5.14. Let $R \subseteq {}^4(K_\lambda)$ be a relation. We say $\bigotimes_R^-$ when:

1. If $R(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$ *then* $n \in \{1, 2\} \Rightarrow M_0 \preceq M_n \preceq M_3$.
2. Weak Uniqueness: Suppose for $x = a, b$ (f_1^x, f_2^x, N_3^x) is an amalgamation of N_1 and N_2 over N_0 and $R(N_0, f_1^x[N_1], f_2^x[N_2], N_3^x)$. Then $(f_1^a, f_2^a, N_3^a)E_{N_0}(f_1^b, f_2^b, N_3^b)$.
3. If $R(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$ and $f : M_2 \to M_4$ is an embedding, then there is an amalgamation (g, id_{M_4}, M_5) of M_3, M_4 over M_2 such that $R(f[M_0], g[M_1], M_4, M_5)$.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
M_1 \arrow[r, "id"] & M_3 \arrow[r, "g"] & M_5 \\
M_0 \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_2 \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "f"] & M_4 \arrow[u, "id"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

Definition 5.15. $NF^{uq} := \{(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$:there is $a \in M_1 - M_0$ such that $(M_0, M_1, a) \in K^{3,uq}$ and $tp(a, M_2, M_3)$ does not fork over $M_0\}$.

Proposition 5.16.

(1) $\bigotimes_{NF^{uq}}^-$.
(2) For every relation R, $\bigotimes_R \Rightarrow \bigotimes_R^-$.

Proof.

1. By the definition of $K^{3,uq}$ (Definition 4.4), Definition 2.1.3.f and Definition 2.1.1.d (to get M_5).
2. By axioms d,f in Definition 5.2 and by Proposition 2.15.

⊣

Proposition 5.17 (the transitivity of the weak uniqueness)**.** *Suppose*

(1) $\bigotimes_R^-$.
(2) $\alpha^* \leq \lambda^+$.
(3) For every $\alpha < \alpha^*$ $N_{1,\alpha}, N_{2,\alpha}^a, N_{2,\alpha}^b \in K_\lambda$.
(4) $\langle N_{1,\alpha} : \alpha \leq \alpha^* \rangle$, $\langle N_{2,\alpha}^a : \alpha \leq \alpha^* \rangle$, $\langle N_{2,\alpha}^b : \alpha \leq \alpha^* \rangle$ *are increasing continuous sequences.*
(5) $N_{2,0}^a = N_{2,0}^b$.
(6) For every $\alpha \leq \alpha^*$ $f_\alpha^a : N_{1,\alpha} \to N_{2,\alpha}^a$ *and* $f_\alpha^b : N_{1,\alpha} \to N_{2,\alpha}^b$.
(7) $(\alpha < \alpha^* \wedge x \in \{a, b\}) \Rightarrow R(f_\alpha^x[N_{1,\alpha}], f_{\alpha+1}^x[N_{1,\alpha+1}], N_{2,\alpha}^x, N_{2,\alpha+1}^x)$.

Then $(f_{\alpha^*}^a, id_{N_{2,0}^a}, N_{2,\alpha^*}^a)E_{N_{1,0}}(f_{\alpha^*}^a, id_{N_{2,0}^a}, N_{2,\alpha^*}^b)$.

Proof. We choose $N_{2,\alpha}, g_{a,\alpha}, g_{b,\alpha}$ by induction on $\alpha \leq \alpha^*$, such that for $x = a, b$ and $\alpha \leq \alpha^*$ the following hold:

(i) $g_{x,\alpha} : N^x_{2,\alpha} \to N_{2,\alpha}$ is an embedding such that $g_{a,\alpha} \circ f^a_\alpha = g_{b,\alpha} \circ f_{b,\alpha}$.
(ii) $N_{2,0} = N^x_{2,0}, g_{x,0} = identity$.
(iii) $\langle N_{2,\alpha} : \alpha \leq \alpha^* \rangle$ is an increasing continuous sequence.
(iv) $\langle g_{x,\alpha} : \alpha \leq \alpha^* \rangle$ is an increasing continuous sequence.

If we can construct this, then the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & N^a_{2,\alpha^*} \arrow[rr, "g_{a,\alpha^*}"] & & N_{2,\alpha^*} \\
N_{1,\alpha} \arrow[ur, "f^a_{\alpha^*}"] \arrow[rr, "f^b_{\alpha^*}"] & & N^b_{2,\alpha^*} \arrow[ur, "g_{b,\alpha^*}"] & \\
N_{1,0} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & N_{2,0} \arrow[uu, "id"] \arrow[ur, "id"] & &
\end{tikzcd}$$

[By clause (i) $g_{a,\alpha^*} \circ f^a_{\alpha^*} = g_{b,\alpha^*} \circ f^b_{\alpha^*}$ and by clauses $(ii), (iv)$ $g_{x,\alpha^*} \supseteq g_{x,0} = id_{N_{2,0}}$].

Therefore $(g_{a,\alpha^*}, g_{b,\alpha^*}, N_{2,\alpha^*})$ witnesses that $(f^a_{\alpha^*}, id_{N_{2,0}}, N^a_{2,\alpha^*}) E_{N_{1,0}} (f^b_{\alpha^*}, id_{N_{2,0}}, N^b_{2,\alpha^*})$.

Why can we construct this? For $\alpha = 0$ only clause (ii) is relevant. For α limit ordinal, take unions, and by the smoothness, $g_{x,\alpha}$ is $\preceq$-embedding. What will we do for $\alpha+1$? By clause 7 for $x = a, b$ $R(f^x_\alpha[N_{1,\alpha}], f^x_{\alpha+1}[N_{1,\alpha+1}], N^x_{2,\alpha}, N^x_{2,\alpha+1})$. By clause (i) $g_{x,\alpha}[N^x_{2,\alpha}] \preceq N_{2,\alpha}$ and by clause 1 $\bigotimes^-_R$. So by Definition 5.14.3 we can find g_x, N^x such that the following hold:

(1) $g_x : N^x_{2,\alpha+1} \to N^x$ is an embedding.
(2) $g_{x,\alpha} \subset g_x$.
(3) $R(g_x \circ f^a_\alpha[N_{1,\alpha}], g_x \circ f^a_{\alpha+1}[N_{1,\alpha+1}], N_{2,\alpha}, N^x)$.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & & & & N^a \arrow[r, "h^a"] & N_{2,\alpha+1} \\
 & N^a_{2,\alpha+1} \arrow[rrru, "g_a"] & & & & N^b \arrow[u, "h^b"] \\
N_{1,\alpha+1} \arrow[ur, "f^a_{\alpha+1}"] \arrow[rr, "f^b_{\alpha+1}"] & & N^b_{2,\alpha+1} \arrow[rrru, "g_b"] & & & \\
 & N^a_{2,\alpha} \arrow[uu, "id"] \arrow[rrr, "g_{a,\alpha}"] & & & N_{2,\alpha} \arrow[uuu, "id"] \arrow[uur, "id"] & \\
N_{1,\alpha} \arrow[uu, "id"] \arrow[ur, "f^a_\alpha"] \arrow[rr, "f^b_\alpha"] & & N^b_{2,\alpha} \arrow[uu, "id"] \arrow[urr, "g_{b,\alpha}"] & & &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Hence by Definition 5.14.2 $(g_a \restriction f^a_{\alpha+1}[N_{1,\alpha+1}], id_{N_{2,\alpha}}, N^a) E_{f^a_\alpha[N_{1,\alpha}]} (g_b \restriction f^b_{\alpha+1}[N_{1,\alpha+1}], id_{N_{2,\alpha}}, N^b)$. So there is a joint embedding $(h^a, h^b, N_{2,\alpha+1})$ of N^a, N^b such that for $x = a, b$ $id_{N_{2,\alpha}} \subseteq h^x$ and $h^a \circ g_\alpha \circ f^a_{\alpha+1} = h^b \circ g_b \circ f^b_{\alpha+1}$. Now we define $g_{x,\alpha+1} := h^x \circ g_x$. ⊣

The following proposition asserts that we have weak uniqueness over first witness for NF^*.

Proposition 5.18. *If for $x = a, b$ $NF^*(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3^x)$ and they have the same first witness, then there is a joint embedding of N_3^a, N_3^b over $N_1 \bigcup N_2$.*

Proof. By Proposition 5.16.1, $\bigotimes^-_{NF^{uq}}$. Hence it follows by Proposition 5.17. ⊣

The following proposition is similar to weak uniqueness for NF^*, but notice to the order of N_1, N_2 in the two quadruples.

Proposition 5.19 (the opposite uniqueness proposition)**.** *Suppose $NF^*(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3^a)$ and $NF^*(N_0, N_2, N_1, N_3^b)$. Then there is a joint embedding of N_3^a and N_3^b over $N_1 \bigcup N_2$.*

Proof. Let $\langle N^a_\alpha, d^a_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle ^\frown \langle N^a_{\alpha^*} \rangle$ be a first witness for $NF^*(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3^a)$ and let $\langle N^b_\beta, d^b_\beta : \beta < \beta^* \rangle ^\frown \langle N^b_{\beta^*} \rangle$ be a first witness for $NF^*(N_0, N_2, N_1, N_3^b)$. By Proposition 3.5 (page 25), there is a rectangle $\{M_{\alpha,\beta} : \alpha \leq \alpha^*, \beta \leq \beta^*\}$ such that:

1. $M_{\alpha,0} = N^a_\alpha$.
2. $M_{0,\beta} = N^b_\beta$.
3. $tp(d^a_\alpha, M_{\alpha,\beta}, M_{\alpha+1,\beta})$ does not fork over $M_{\alpha,0}$.
4. $tp(d^b_\beta, M_{\alpha,\beta}, M_{\alpha,\beta+1})$ does not fork over $M_{0,\beta}$.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & & N_3^a \arrow[r, "f^a"] & N_3^{a,*} \arrow[r, "g^a"] & N^* \\
N_1 = N_{1,\alpha^*} \arrow[urr, "id"] \arrow[rrr, "id"] \arrow[drrrr, "id"] & & & M_{\alpha^*,\beta^*} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & N_3^{b,*} \arrow[u, "g^b"] \\
d_\alpha^a \in N_{\alpha+1}^a \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_{\alpha+1,\beta} \arrow[r, "id"] & M_{\alpha+1,\beta+1} \arrow[ur, "id"] & & N_3^b \arrow[u, "f^b"] \\
N_\alpha^a = M_{\alpha,0} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_{\alpha,\beta} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_{\alpha,\beta+1} \arrow[u, "id"] & & \\
N_1^a = M_{1,0} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_{1,\beta} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_{1,\beta+1} \arrow[u, "id"] & & \\
N_0 = M_{0,0} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & N_\beta^b = M_{0,\beta} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & N_{\beta+1}^b \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & N_2 = M_{0,\beta^*} \arrow[uuuuul, "id"] \arrow[uuuu, "id"] \arrow[uuur, "id"] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

By clauses 1,3 $\langle d_\alpha^a, N_\alpha^a : \alpha < \alpha^a \rangle$ is a first witness for $NF^*(N_0, N_1, N_2, M_{\alpha^*,\beta^*})$. But by definition this is also a first witness for $NF^*(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3^a)$. So by Proposition 5.18, there is a joint embedding $(id_{M_{\alpha^*,\beta^*}}, f^a, N_3^{a,*})$ of $M_{\alpha^*,\beta^*}, N_3^a$ over $N_1 \bigcup N_2$. Similarly by clauses 2,4 there is a joint embedding $(id_{M_{\alpha^*,\beta^*}}, f^b, N_3^{b,*})$ of $M_{\alpha^*,\beta^*}, N_3^b$ over $N_1 \bigcup N_2$. Since $(K_\lambda, \preceq \restriction K_\lambda)$ has amalgamation, there is an amalgamation (g^a, g^b, N_3) of $N_3^{a,*}, N_3^{b,*}$ over M_{α^*,β^*}. N_3 is an amalgam of N_3^a, N_3^b over $N_1 \bigcup N_2$. $\dashv$

Theorem 5.20 (the weak uniqueness theorem). *Suppose for* $x = a, b$ $NF(M_0, M_1, M_2, M^x)$. *Then there is a joint embedding of* M^a, M^b *over* $M_1 \bigcup M_2$.

Proof. First note that since $M_1 \bigcap M_2 = M_0$, the conclusion of the theorem is equivalent to $(id_{M_1}, id_{M_2}, M^a)E_{M_0}(id_{M_1}, id_{M_2}, M^b)$.

Case a: $NF^*(M_0, M_1, M_2, M^x)$ and M_2 is decomposable over M_0. In this case, by Theorem 5.11.b (the existence theorem for NF) there is M^c such that $NF^*(M_0, M_2, M_1, M^c)$. By Proposition 5.19 for $x = a, b$ $id_{M_1}, id_{M_2}, M^x)E_{M_0}$ $(id_{M_1}, id_{M_2}, M^c)$. But the relation E_{M_0} is an equivalence relation, so it is transitive.

The general case: Since $NF(M_0, M_1, M_2, M^a,)$ by Proposition 5.13.5 there are $N_1^a, N^{a,-}$ such that $NF^*(M_0, N_1^a, M_2, N^{a,-})$ and $M_1 \preceq N_1^a \preceq N^{a,-} \wedge M^a \preceq N^{a,-}$. Similarly there are $N_1^b, N^{b,-}$ such that $NF^*(M_0, N_1^b, M_2, N_3^b)$ and $M_1 \preceq N_1^b \preceq N^{b,-} \wedge M^b \preceq N^{b,-}$. By Theorem 3.8 (the extensions decomposition theorem) there is a model $M_2^+ \succeq M_2$ which is decomposable over M_0. Without loss of generality for $x = a, b$ $M_2^+ \bigcap N^{x,-} = M_2$. So by

Theorem 3.8.3 (the extensions decomposition theorem) there is $N^x \succeq N^{x,-}$ such that $NF^*(M_0, N_1^x, M_2^+, N^x)$.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & & N^{a,+} & \\
 & N_1 \arrow[ur, "g_1^a"] \arrow[rr, "g_1^b"] & & N^{b,+} \\
N_1^a \arrow[ur, "f_1^a"] \arrow[rr, "id"] & & N^a \arrow[uu, "g^a"] & \\
 & N_1^b \arrow[uu, "f_1^b"] \arrow[rr, "id"] & & N^b \arrow[uu, "g^b"] \\
 & M^a \arrow[uur] & & \\
M_1 \arrow[uuu, "id"] \arrow[uur, "id"] \arrow[ur, "id"] \arrow[rrr, "id"] & & & M^b \arrow[uu, "id"] \\
M_0 \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[rr, "id"] & & M_2^+ \arrow[uuuu, "id"] \arrow[uuur, "id"] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

By Proposition 3.9 there is an amalgamation (f_1^a, f_1^b, N_1) of N_1^a, N_1^b over M_1 such that N_1 is decomposable over N_1^a and over N_1^b. Hence for $x = a, b$ there is an amalgamation $(g_1^x, g^x, N^{x,+})$ of N_1, N^x over N_1^x such that $NF^*(g_1^x \circ f_1^x[N_1^x], g_1^x[N_1], g^x[N^x], N^{x,+})$. So for $x = a, b$ by Proposition 5.13.8 (a private case of transitivity), since $NF^*(M_0, N_1^x, M_2^+, N^x)$ and $NF^*(N_1^x, N^x, N_1, N^{x,+})$ it follows that $NF^*(M_0, N_1, M_2^+, N^{x,+})$. So by case a $(g_1^a, g^a \restriction M_2^+, N^{a,+})E_{M_0}(g_1^b, g^b \restriction M_2^+, N^{b,+}$. Therefore $(g_1^a \restriction M_1, g^a \restriction M_2, N^{a,+})E_{M_0}(g_1^b \restriction M_1, g^b \restriction M_2, N^{b,+})$. ⊣

Proposition 5.21. $\bigotimes_{NF}^-$.

Proof. We have to check clauses 1,2,3 of Definition 5.14 (on page 42).

1. Trivial.
2. By Theorem 5.20.
3. Suppose $NF(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$ and $f : M_2 \to M_4$ is an embedding. We have to find a model M_5 and an embedding $g : M_3 \to M_5$ over M_2 such that $NF(f[M_0], g[M_1], M_4, M_5)$. By Theorem 5.13.2 we can find N_1, N_3 such that $NF^*(M_1, N_1, M_2, N_3)$ and $M_1 \preceq N_1 \preceq N_3 \wedge M_3 \preceq N_3$. By Theorem 5.11.b (the existence theorem for NF, on page 40) we can find a model M_5 with $M_4 \preceq M_5$ and an embedding $h : N_3 \to M_5$ such that $NF^*(M_0, M_4, N_1, M_5)$. Hence $NF(M_0, M_1, M_4, M_5)$. Now we define $g := h \restriction M_3$. ⊣

Theorem 5.22 (the symmetry theorem). $NF(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3) \Leftrightarrow NF(N_0, N_2, N_1, N_3)$.

Proof. By the monotonicity of NF, i.e. Propositon 5.13.3, It is sufficient to prove $NF^*(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3) \Rightarrow NF(N_0, N_2, N_1, N_3)$. Suppose $NF^*(N_0, N_1, N_2, N_3)$. By Theorem 3.8 (the extensions decomposition theorem) there is $N_2^+ \succeq N_2$ which is decomposable over N_0. By Theorem 5.11.b there is an amalgamation (id_{N_1}, f, N_3^+) of N_1, N_2^+ over N_2 such that $NF^*(N_0, N_1, f[N_2^+], N_3^+)$. So $N_1 \bigcap f[N_2^+] = N_0$. Hence by Theorem 5.11.b, there is a model N^* such that $NF^*(N_0, f[N_2^+], N_1, N^*)$. By Proposition 5.19 (the opposite uniqueness proposition) there is a joint embedding $id_{N_3^+}, g, N^{**}$ of N_3^+ and N^* over $N_1 \bigcup f[N_2^+]$. Since NF^* is closed under isomorphisms, $NF^*(N_0, f[N_2^+], N_1, g[N^*])$. Now we have to use the monotonicity of NF twice. Since $N_0 \preceq N_2 \preceq f[N_2^*]$ it follows that $NF^*(N_0, N_2, N_1, g[N^*])$. Since $N_3 \preceq N_3^* \preceq N^{**} \succeq g[N^*]$, it follows that $NF(N_0, N_2, N_1, N_3)$. $\dashv$

Theorem 5.23. *NF respects $\mathfrak{s}$ (see Definition 5.5)*

Proof. Suppose $NF(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$, $tp(a, M_0, M_1) \in S^{bs}(M_0)$. We have to prove that $tp(a, M_2, M_3)$ does not fork over M_0. Without loss of generality $NF^*(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$ [Why? see the Definition 2.1.3.b (monotonicity)]. By the definition of NF^*, M_1 is decomposable over M_0. By of NF, (Theorem 5.11.c (the existence theorem for NF), there is M_3^* such that $NF^*(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3^*)$ and the first element in the first witness is a.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & M_3^* & \\
a \in M_1 \arrow[ur, "id"] \arrow[rr, "id"] & & M_3 \\
M_0 \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_2 \arrow[uu, "id"] \arrow[ur, "id"] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

By the definition of a first witness, $tp(a, M_2, M_3^*)$ does not fork over M_0. By the weak uniqueness theorem (Theorem 5.20) there are f, M_3^{**} such that $M_3 \preceq M_3^{**}$, and $f : M_3^* \to M_3^{**}$ is an embedding over $M_1 \bigcup M_2$. So $tp(a, M_2, M_3) = tp(a, M_2, f[M_3^*]) = tp(a, M_2, M_3^*)$ does not fork over M_0. $\dashv$

5.4. **Long transitivity.**

Proposition 5.24. *Let $\langle M_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \leq \alpha^* \rangle$ be a $\prec$-increasing continuous sequence of models in K_λ.*

(a) There is an $\prec$-increasing continuous sequence of models in K_lambda $\langle N_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \leq \alpha^* \rangle$ such that: $N_0 = M_0$, $M_\varepsilon \preceq N_\varepsilon$, $NF(M_\varepsilon, M_{\varepsilon+1}, N_\varepsilon, N_{\varepsilon+1})$ and $N_{\varepsilon+1}$ is decomposable over N_ε and over $M_{\varepsilon+1}$.

(b) *Suppose* $M^* \in K_\lambda$, $M^* \succ M_0$ *and* $M^* \bigcap M_{\alpha^*} = M_0$. *Then there is an* $\prec$-*increasing continuous sequence of models in* K_λ $\langle N_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \leq \alpha^* \rangle$ *such that:* $M^* \preceq N_0$, $M_\varepsilon \preceq N_\varepsilon$, $NF(M_\varepsilon, M_{\varepsilon+1}, N_\varepsilon, N_{\varepsilon+1})$, N_0 *is decomposable over* M_0 *and* $N_{\varepsilon+1}$ *is decomposable over* N_ε *and over* $M_{\varepsilon+1}$.

Proof. (a) We choose a pair $(N_\varepsilon, f_\varepsilon)$ by induction on $\varepsilon \leq \alpha$ such that:

1. $\langle N_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \leq \alpha \rangle$ is an increasing continuous sequence of models in K_λ.
2. $f_\varepsilon : M_\varepsilon \to N_\varepsilon$ is an embedding.
3. $f_0 = id_{M_0}$.
4. The sequence $\langle f_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \leq \alpha \rangle$ is increasing and continuous.
5. For $\varepsilon < \alpha^*$, $NF(f_\varepsilon[M_\varepsilon], N_\varepsilon, f_{\varepsilon+1}[M_{\varepsilon+1}], N_{\varepsilon+1})$.
6. For $\varepsilon < \alpha^*$, $N_{\varepsilon+1}$ is decomposable over N_ε and over $f_{\varepsilon+1}[M_{\varepsilon+1}]$.

Why can we carry out this construction? For $\varepsilon = 0$ or limit there is no problem. Suppose we chose $(N_\varepsilon, f_\varepsilon)$, how will we choose $(N_{\varepsilon+1}, f_{\varepsilon+1})$? By Theorem 5.11.a we can find $N^-_{\varepsilon+1}$ and $f_{\varepsilon+1}$ such that $NF(f_\varepsilon[M_\varepsilon], N_\varepsilon, f_{\varepsilon+1}[M_{\varepsilon+1}], N^-_{\varepsilon+1})$. Now by Proposition 3.9 we can find $N_{\varepsilon+1}$ such that $N^-_{\varepsilon+1} \preceq N_{\varepsilon+1}$ and $N_{\varepsilon+1}$ is decomposable over N_ε and over $f_{\varepsilon+1}[M_{\varepsilon+1}]$. Therefore we can carry out this construction.

Now, as in the proof of Proposition 3.4, without loss of generality $f_\varepsilon = id_{M_\varepsilon}$ for every $\varepsilon \leq \alpha^*$ (because we can extend $f^{-1}_{\alpha^*}$ to a bijection g of N_{α^*} and take the sequence $\langle g[N_\varepsilon] : \varepsilon \leq \alpha^* \rangle$).

(b) It demands a tiny change in the proof: In the construction $M^* \preceq N_0$ and it is decomposable over M_0.

$\dashv$

Theorem 5.25 (the long transitivity theorem)**.** *For* $x = a, b$ *let* $\langle M_{x,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon \leq \alpha^* \rangle$ *be an* $\prec$-*increasing continuous sequence of models in* K_λ. *Suppose* $\varepsilon < \alpha^* \Rightarrow NF(M_{a,\varepsilon}, M_{a,\varepsilon+1}, M_{b,\varepsilon}, M_{b,\varepsilon+1})$. *Then* $NF(M_{a,0}, M_{a,\alpha^*}, M_{b,0}, M_{b,\alpha^*})$.

Similarly to the proof of Proposition 2.15 (the transitivity proposition), we use the existence and weak uniqueness theorems to prove the long transitivity. But here the proof is more complicated, and it is divided to four cases, each one is based on its previous and generalizes it.

Proof. Case a: $\varepsilon < \alpha^* \Rightarrow NF^*(M_{a,\varepsilon}, M_{a,\varepsilon+1}, M_{b,\varepsilon}, M_{b,\varepsilon+1})$. Concatenate all the sequences together.

In the other cases we are going to use the following claim:

Claim 5.26. *It is enough to find* $(N_{b,\varepsilon}, f_\varepsilon)$ *for* $\varepsilon \leq \alpha^*$ *such that:*

1. $M_{b,0} \preceq N_{b,0}$.
2. $\langle N_{b,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon \leq \alpha^* \rangle$ *is an increasing continuous sequence of models in* K_λ.
3. f_ε *is an embedding of* $M_{a,\varepsilon}$ *to* $N_{b,\varepsilon}$.
4. $f_0 = id_{M_{a,0}}$.
5. $\langle f_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \leq \alpha^* \rangle$ *is an increasing continuous sequence.*
6. *For* $\varepsilon < \alpha^*$, $NF(f_\varepsilon[M_{a,\varepsilon}], f_{\varepsilon+1}[M_{a,\varepsilon+1}], N_{b,\varepsilon}, N_{b,\varepsilon+1})$.
7. $NF(M_{a,0}, f_{\alpha^*}[M_{a,\alpha^*}], N_{b,0}, N_{b,\alpha^*})$.

Proof. Suppose we found $(N_{b,\varepsilon}, f_\varepsilon)$ for $\varepsilon \leq \alpha^*$ such that clauses 1-7 are satisfied. By Proposition 5.21, $\bigotimes^-_{NF}$. Therefore by Proposition 5.17 (the transitivity of the uniqueness) $(id_{M_{a,\alpha^*}}, id_{M_{b,0}}, M_{b,\alpha^*})E_{M_{a,0}}(f^a_{\alpha^*}, id_{M_{b,0}}, N_{b,\alpha^*})$ [Substitute $\langle M_{a,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon \leq \alpha^*\rangle$, $\langle M_{b,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon \leq \alpha^*\rangle$, $\langle N_{b,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon \leq \alpha^*\rangle$, $\langle id_{M_{a,\varepsilon}} : \varepsilon \leq \alpha^*\rangle$, $\langle f_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \leq \alpha^*\rangle$ in place of $\langle N_{1,\alpha} : \alpha \leq \alpha^*\rangle$, $\langle N^a_{2,\alpha} : \alpha \leq \alpha^*\rangle$, $\langle N^b_{2,\alpha} : \alpha \leq \alpha^*\rangle$, $\langle f^a_\alpha : \alpha \leq \alpha^*\rangle$, $\langle f^b_\alpha : \alpha \leq \alpha^*\rangle$] . By clause 7 $NF(M_{a,0}, M_{a,\alpha^*}, N_{b,0}, N_{b,\alpha^*})$. So by Proposition 5.9 $NF(M_{a,0}, M_{a,\alpha^*}, M_{b,0}, M_{b,\alpha^*})$. $\dashv$

Case b: For every ε, $M_{a,\varepsilon+1}$ is *decomposable* over $M_{a,\varepsilon}$. In this case we choose $(N_{b,\varepsilon}, f_\varepsilon)$ such that clauses 1-6 of Claim 5.26 are satisfied: For $\varepsilon = 0$ we define $N_{b,0} := M_{b,0}$. In successor step we use Theorem 5.11.a. For ε limit we define $N_{b,\varepsilon} := \bigcup\{N_{b,\zeta} : \zeta < \varepsilon\}$, $f_\varepsilon := \bigcup\{f_\zeta : \zeta < \varepsilon\}$. Now clause 7 is satisfied by case a of the proof.

Case c: $\alpha^* \leq \omega$. In this case we apply Claim 5.26 with $f_\varepsilon = id_{M_{a,\varepsilon}}$.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
N_{b,0} \arrow[r, "id"] & N_{b,1} \arrow[r, "id"] & N_{b,2} \arrow[r, "id"] & N_{b,\varepsilon} \arrow[r, "id"] & N_{b,\varepsilon+1} \arrow[r, "id"] & N_{b,\alpha^*} \\
M_{b,0} \arrow[u, "id"] & & & & & \\
M_{a,0} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & N_{a,1} \arrow[uu, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & N_{a,2} \arrow[uu, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & N_{a,\varepsilon} \arrow[uu, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & N_{a,\varepsilon+1} \arrow[uu, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & N_{a,\alpha^*} \arrow[uu, "id"] \\
M_{a,0} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_{a,1} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_{a,2} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_{a,\varepsilon} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_{a,\varepsilon+1} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_{a,\alpha^*} \arrow[u, "id"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

By Proposition 5.24.a, there is an increasing continuous sequence $\langle N_{a,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon \leq \alpha^*\rangle$ such that: $N_{a,0} = M_{a,0}$, $M_{a,\varepsilon} \preceq N_{a,\varepsilon}$, $N_{a,\varepsilon+1}$ is decomposable over $N_{a,\varepsilon}$ and over $M_{a,\varepsilon+1}$ and $\varepsilon < \alpha^* \Rightarrow NF(M_{a,\varepsilon}, M_{a,\varepsilon+1}, N_{a,\varepsilon}, N_{a,\varepsilon+1})$. Since $\alpha^* \leq \omega$, by Proposition 5.24.b, there is an increasing continuous sequence $\langle N_{b,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon \leq \alpha^*\rangle$ such that $N_{b,0} \succ M_{b,0}$, for $\varepsilon \leq \alpha^*$, $N_{b,\varepsilon}$ is decomposable over $N_{a,\varepsilon}$ and $NF^*(N_{a,\varepsilon}, N_{a,\varepsilon+1}, N_{b,\varepsilon}, N_{b,\varepsilon+1})$.

Now it is enough to prove that $\langle (N_{b,\varepsilon}, id_{M_{a,\varepsilon}}) : \varepsilon \leq \alpha^*\rangle$ satisfies clauses 1-7 of Claim 5.26. Clauses 1-5 are satisfied trivially. We check clauses 6,7.

6. First assume $\varepsilon > 0$. As $NF(M_{a,\varepsilon}, M_{a,\varepsilon+1}, N_{a,\varepsilon}, N_{a,\varepsilon+1})$, $NF(N_{a,\varepsilon}, N_{a,\varepsilon+1}, N_{b,\varepsilon}, N_{b,\varepsilon+1})$, $N_{a,\varepsilon}$ is decomposable over $M_{a,\varepsilon}$ and $N_{b,\varepsilon}$ is decomposable over $N_{a,\varepsilon}$, by case b (for $\alpha^* = 2$), $NF(M_{a,\varepsilon}, M_{a,\varepsilon+1}, N_{b,\varepsilon}, N_{b,\varepsilon+1})$. Second assume $\varepsilon = 0$. As $NF(N_{a,0}, N_{a,1}, N_{b,0}, N_{b,1})$, $N_{a,0} = M_{a,0}$ and $M_{a,1} \preceq N_{a,1}$, by the monotonicity of NF, $NF(M_{a,0}, M_{a,1}, N_{b,0}, N_{b,1})$

7. By case b, we have $NF(N_{a,0}, N_{a,\alpha^*}, N_{b,0}, N_{b,\alpha^*})$. By the smoothness $M_{a,\alpha^*} \preceq N_{a,\alpha^*}$. So by the monotonicity of NF, $NF(M_{a,0}, M_{a,\alpha^*}, N_{b,0}, N_{b,\alpha^*})$.

The general case: By the proof of case c. We have only one problem: For ε limit it is not clear why does $NF(M_{a,\varepsilon}, M_{a,\varepsilon+1}, N_{b,\varepsilon}, N_{b,\varepsilon+1})$, where we know $NF(M_{a,\varepsilon}, M_{a,\varepsilon+1}, N_{a,\varepsilon}, N_{a,\varepsilon+1}) \wedge NF(N_{a,\varepsilon}, N_{a,\varepsilon+1}, N_{b,\varepsilon}, N_{b,\varepsilon+1})$. Here we cannot use case b, because we do not know if $N_{b,\varepsilon}$ is decomposable over $N_{a,\varepsilon}$ and $N_{a,\varepsilon}$ is decomposable over $M_{a,\varepsilon}$. But we can use case c with $\alpha^* = 2$. $\dashv$

Theorem 5.27. *$NF = NF_\lambda$ is the unique relation which satisfies $\bigotimes_{NF}$ and respects $\mathfrak{s}$.*

Proof. NF satisfies $\bigotimes_{NF}$: Clause a is clear. Clause b (the monotonicity) by Theorem 5.13.4. Clause c (the existence) by Theorem 5.11.a. Clause d (weak uniqueness) by Theorem 5.20. Clause e (symmetry) by Theorem 5.22. Clause f (long transitivity) by Theorem 5.25. By Theorem 5.23 NF respects $\mathfrak{s}$.

Suppose the relation R satisfies $\bigotimes_R$ and respects $\mathfrak{s}$. First we prove $NF(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3) \Rightarrow R(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$.

case a: Take $a \in M_1 - M_0$ with $(M_0, M_1, a) \in K^{3,uq}$. As NF respects $\mathfrak{s}$, $tp(a, M_2, M_3)$ does not fork over M_0. So as R respects $\mathfrak{s}$, by the definition of unique triples (see Definition 4.4 on page 31), $R(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$.

case b: $NF^*(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$. As R satisfies long transitivity, and by case a, $R(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$.

The general case: Since R satisfies monotonicity, by case b, $R(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$. So we have proved that the relation NF is included in the relation R.

conversely: Suppose $R(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$. We have to prove that $NF(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$. As $\bigotimes_R$, R satisfies disjointness. So $M_1 \bigcap M_2 = M_0$. By $\bigotimes_{NF}$, for some model M_4 $NF(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_4)$. But by the first direction of the proof $NF(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_4) \Rightarrow R(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_4)$, so $R(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_4)$. As $\bigotimes_R$, R satisfies weak uniqueness, $R(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$ and $R(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_4)$, it follows that $(id_{M_1}, id_{M_2}, M_3) E_{M_0} (id_{M_1}, id_{M_2}, M_4)$. Therefore by Proposition 5.9 $NF(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_4)$ implies $NF(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$, so $NF(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$ as required.

$\dashv$

6. A RELATION ON K_{λ^+} THAT IS BASED ON THE RELATION NF

Remember that we want to derive from $\mathfrak{s}$ a good λ^+-frame. So first we have to define an a.e.c. in λ^+ with amalgamation. Definition 6.4 presents the relation on models of this a.e.c. in λ^+.

Hypothesis 6.1. $\mathfrak{s}$ is a weakly successful semi-good λ-frame with conjugation.

Definition 6.2. Define a 4-place relation $\widehat{NF}$ on K by $\widehat{NF}(N_0, N_1, M_0, M_1)$ iff the following hold:

1. $n < 2 \Rightarrow N_n \in K_\lambda,\ M_n \in K_{\lambda^+}$.
2. There is a pair of increasing continuous sequences $\langle N_{0,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$, $\langle N_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ such that for every α, $NF(N_{0,\alpha}, N_{1,\alpha}, N_{0,\alpha+1}, N_{1,\alpha+1})$ and for $n < 2$, $N_{0,n} = N_n,\ M_n = \bigcup \{N_{n,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+\}$.

Theorem 6.3 (the $\widehat{NF}$-properties)**.**

(a) Disjointness: If $\widehat{NF}(N_0, N_1, M_0, M_1)$ then $N_1 \bigcap M_0 = N_0$.

(b) *Monotonicity: Suppose* $\widehat{NF}(N_0, N_1, M_0, M_1)$, $N_0 \preceq N_1^* \preceq N_1$, $N_1^* \bigcup M_0 \subseteq M_1^* \preceq M_1$ *and* $M_1^* \in K_{\lambda^+}$. *Then* $\widehat{NF}(N_0, N_1^*, M_0, M_1^*)$.

(c) *Existence: Suppose* $n < 2 \Rightarrow N_n \in K_\lambda$, $M_0 \in K_{\lambda^+}$, $N_0 \preceq N_1$, $N_0 \preceq M_0$, $N_1 \bigcap M_0 = N_0$. *Then there is a model* M_1 *such that* $\widehat{NF}(N_0, N_1, M_0, M_1)$.

(d) *Weak Uniqueness: If* $n < 2 \Rightarrow \widehat{NF}(N_0, N_1, M_0, M_{1,n})$, *then there are* M, f_0, f_1 *such that* f_n *is an embedding of* $M_{1,n}$ *into* M *over* $N_1 \bigcup M_0$.

(e) *Respecting the frame: Suppose* $\widehat{NF}(N_0, N_1, M_0, M_1), tp(a, N_0, M_0) \in S^{bs}(N_0)$. *Then* $tp(a, N_1, M_1)$ *does not fork over* N_0.

Proof. (a) Disjointness: Let $\langle N_{0,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$, $\langle N_{1,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$ be witnesses for $\widehat{NF}(N_0, N_1, M_0, M_1)$. Especially $\varepsilon < \lambda^+ \Rightarrow NF(N_{0,\varepsilon}, N_{1,\varepsilon}, N_{0,\varepsilon+1}, N_{1,\varepsilon+1})$. So by Theorem 5.10.3 $\varepsilon < \lambda^+ \Rightarrow N_{1,\varepsilon} \bigcap N_{0,\varepsilon+1} = N_{0,\varepsilon}$. So by the proof of Proposition 5.10.2 $N_1 \bigcap M_0 = N_0$. Let $x \in N_1 \bigcap M_0$. So there is $\varepsilon < \lambda^+$ such that $x \in N_{0,\varepsilon}$. Denote $\varepsilon := \text{Min}\{\varepsilon < \lambda^+ : x \in N_{0,\varepsilon}\}$. ε cannot be a limit ordinal as the sequence $\langle N_{0,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$ is continuous. If $\varepsilon = \zeta + 1$ then $x \in N_{0,\zeta+1} \bigcap N_1 \subseteq N_{0,\zeta+1} \bigcap N_{1,\zeta} = N_{0,\zeta}$, in contradiction to the minimality of ε. So ε must be equal to 0. Hence $x \in N_{0,0} = N_0$.

(b) Monotonicity: Let $\langle N_{0,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$, $\langle N_{1,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$ be witnesses for $\widehat{NF}(N_0, N_1, M_0, M_1)$. Let E be a club of λ^+ such that $0 \notin E$ and $\varepsilon \in E \Rightarrow N_{1,\varepsilon} \bigcap M_1^* \preceq N_{1,\varepsilon}$ [Why do we have such a club? Let E be a club of λ^+ such that $0 \notin E$ and $\varepsilon \in E \Rightarrow N_{1,\varepsilon} \bigcap M_1^* \preceq M_1^*$. By the assumption $M_1^* \preceq M_1$. So $\varepsilon \in E \Rightarrow N_{1,\varepsilon} \bigcap M_1^* \preceq M_1$. Now as $N_{1,\varepsilon} \preceq M_1$, by axiom 1.1.1.e $\varepsilon \in E \Rightarrow N_{1,\varepsilon} \bigcap M_1^* \preceq N_{1,\varepsilon}$]. We will prove that the sequences $\langle N_0\rangle^\frown\langle N_{0,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon \in E\rangle$, $\langle N_1^*\rangle^\frown\langle N_{1,\varepsilon} \bigcap M_1^* : \varepsilon \in E\rangle$ witness that $\widehat{NF}(N_0, N_1^*, M_0, M_1^*)$. First, they are increasing [Why $\varepsilon < \zeta \wedge \{\varepsilon, \zeta\} \subseteq E \Rightarrow N_{1,\varepsilon} \bigcap M_1^* \preceq N_{1,\zeta} \bigcap M_1^*$? By the properties of E, $N_{1,\varepsilon} \bigcap M_1^* \preceq N_{1,\varepsilon}$. But $N_\varepsilon \preceq N_\zeta$. So $N_{1,\varepsilon} \bigcap M_1^* \preceq N_{1,\zeta}$. In the other side again by the properties of E, $N_{1,\varepsilon} \bigcap M_1^* \subseteq N_{1,\zeta} \bigcap M_1^* \preceq N_{1,\zeta}$. So by axiom 1.1.1.e $N_{1,\varepsilon} \bigcap M_1^* \preceq N_{1,\zeta} \bigcap M_1^*$]. Second, we will prove that if $\varepsilon < \zeta$, $\{\varepsilon, \zeta\} \subseteq E$ then $NF(N_{0,\varepsilon}, N_{1,\varepsilon} \bigcap M_1^*, N_{0,\zeta}, N_{1,\zeta} \bigcap M_1^*)$. Fix such ε, ζ. By Theorem 5.25, (the long transitivity theorem), $NF(N_{0,\varepsilon}, N_{1,\varepsilon}, N_{0,\zeta}, N_{1,\zeta})$. By the properties of E and axiom 1.1.1.e, $N_{0,\varepsilon} \preceq N_{1,\varepsilon} \bigcap M_1^* \preceq N_{1,\varepsilon}$, $N_{0,\zeta} \bigcup (N_{1,\varepsilon} \bigcap M_1^*) \subseteq N_{1,\zeta} \bigcap M_1^* \preceq N_{1,\zeta}$. Now by Theorem 5.13.5 (the monotonicity of NF), we have $NF(N_{0,\varepsilon}, N_{1,\varepsilon} \bigcap M_1^*, N_{0,\zeta}, N_{1,\zeta} \bigcap M_1^*)$.

(c) Existence: By Proposition 5.24.b.

(d) Weak Uniqueness: Since $\bigotimes_{NF}$ holds, it follows by Proposition 5.16.2 and Proposition 5.17. But we give another proof using section 7: By Proposition 7.12.f, there is a model $M_{1,n}^+$ such that $M_{1,n} \prec^+ M_{1,n}^+$. By Theorem 7.13.c, there is an isomorphism $f : M_{1,1}^+ \to M_{1,2}^+$ over $M_0 \bigcup N_1$. So $M_{1,2}^+, id_{M_{1,2}}, f \restriction M_{1,1}$ is a witness as required.

(e) Let $\langle N_{0,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$, $\langle N_{1,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$ a witness for $\widehat{NF}(N_0, N_1, M_0, M_1)$. There is ε such that $a \in N_{0,\varepsilon}$. By Definition 6.2 (the definition of $\widehat{NF}$), we have $NF(N_0, N_1, N_{0,\varepsilon}, N_{1,\varepsilon})$. So the proposition is satisfied by Theorem 5.23 (the relation NF respects the frame). $\dashv$

Definition 6.4. $M_0 \preceq^{NF} M_1$ when: there are N_0, N_1 such that $\widehat{NF}(N_0, N_1, M_0, M_1)$.

Proposition 6.5. $(K_{\lambda^+}, \preceq^{NF})$ *satisfies the following properties:*

(a) Suppose $M_0 \preceq M_1$, $n < 2 \Rightarrow M_n \in K_{\lambda^+}$. *For* $n < 2$ *let* $\langle N_{n,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$ *be a representation of* M_n. *Then* $M_0 \preceq^{NF} M_1$ *iff there is a club* $E \subseteq \lambda^+$ *such that* $(\varepsilon < \zeta \wedge \{\varepsilon, \zeta\} \subseteq E) \Rightarrow NF(N_{0,\varepsilon}, N_{0,\zeta}, N_{1,\varepsilon}, N_{1,\zeta})$.

(b) $\preceq^{NF}$ *is a partial order.*

(c) If $M_0 \preceq M_1 \preceq M_2$ *and* $M_0 \preceq^{NF} M_2$ *then* $M_0 \preceq^{NF} M_1$.

(d) It satisfies axiom c of a.e.c. in λ^+, *i.e.: If* $\delta \in \lambda^{+2}$ *is a limit ordinal and* $\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \delta\rangle$ *is a* $\preceq^{NF}$*-increasing continuous sequence, then* $M_0 \preceq^{NF} \bigcup\{M_\alpha : \alpha < \delta\}$ *and obviously it is* $\in K_{\lambda^+}$.

(e) It has no $\preceq^{NF}$*-maximal model.*

(f) If it satisfies smoothness (Definition 1.1.1.d), then it is an a.e.c. in λ^+, *(see Definition 1.1, page 3).*

(g) LST for $\preceq^{NF}$*: If* $M_0 \preceq^{NF} M_1$, $n < 2 \Rightarrow (A_n \subseteq M_n \wedge |A_n| \leq \lambda)$, *then there are models* $N_0, N_1 \in K_\lambda$ *such that:* $\widehat{NF}(N_0, N_1, M_0, M_1)$ *and* $n < 2 \Rightarrow A_n \subseteq N_n$.

Proof. (a) *One direction:* Let E be such a club. So $\langle N_{0,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon \in E\rangle$, $\langle N_{1,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon \in E\rangle$ witness that $M_0 \preceq^{NF} M_1$.
conversely: Let $\langle M_{0,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+\rangle$, $\langle M_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+\rangle$ be witnesses for $M_0 \preceq^{NF} M_1$. Let E be a club such that $(n < 2 \wedge \varepsilon \in E) \Rightarrow M_{n,\alpha} = N_{n,\alpha}$. Suppose $\varepsilon < \zeta \wedge \{\varepsilon, \zeta\} \subseteq E$. We will prove $NF(N_{0,\varepsilon}, N_{1,\varepsilon}, N_{0,\zeta}, N_{1,\zeta})$, i.e. $NF(M_{0,\varepsilon}, M_{1,\varepsilon}, M_{0,\zeta}, M_{1,\zeta})$. The sequences $\langle M_{0,\alpha} : \varepsilon \leq \alpha \leq \zeta\rangle$, $\langle M_{1,\alpha} : \varepsilon \leq \alpha \leq \zeta\rangle$ are increasing and continuous. So by Theorem 5.25 (the long transitivity theorem) $NF(M_{0,\varepsilon}, M_{1,\varepsilon}, M_{0,\zeta}, M_{1,\zeta})$.

(b) The reflexivity is obvious. The antisymmetry is satisfied by the antisymmetry of the inclusion relation. The transitivity is satisfied by item a, Theorem 5.25 and the evidence that the intersection of two clubs is a club.

(c) For $n < 3$ let $\langle M_{n,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+\rangle$ be a representation of M_n such that $\alpha < \lambda^+ \Rightarrow NF(M_{0,\alpha}, M_{0,\alpha+1}, M_{2,\alpha}, M_{2,\alpha+1})$. Let E be a club of λ^+ such that $\alpha \in E \Rightarrow M_{0,\alpha} \preceq M_{1,\alpha} \preceq M_{2,\alpha}$. By the monotonicity of NF $\alpha \in E \Rightarrow NF(M_{0,\alpha}, M_{0,\alpha+1}, M_{1,\alpha}, M_{1,\alpha+1})$. The representations $\langle M_{0,\alpha} : \alpha \in E\rangle$, $\langle M_{1,\alpha} : \alpha \in E\rangle$ witness that $M_0 \preceq^{NF} M_1$.

(d) Without loss of generality $cf(\delta) = \delta$, so $\delta \leq \lambda^+$. Denote $M_\delta := \bigcup\{M_\alpha : \alpha < \delta\}$. For $\alpha < \delta$ let $\langle M_{\alpha,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$ be a representation of M_n. By item a for every α there is a club $E_{\alpha,0} \subseteq \lambda^+$ such that $(\varepsilon < \zeta \wedge \{\varepsilon, \zeta\} \subseteq E_{\alpha,0}) \Rightarrow NF(M_{\alpha,\varepsilon}, M_{\alpha,\zeta}, M_{\alpha+1,\varepsilon}, M_{\alpha+1,\zeta})$. Let α be a limit ordinal. $\bigcup\{M_{\alpha,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\} = M_\alpha = \bigcup\{M_\beta : \beta < \alpha\} = \bigcup\{\bigcup\{M_{\beta,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\} : \beta < \alpha\} = \bigcup\{\bigcup\{M_{\beta,\varepsilon} : \beta < \alpha\} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\}$. Every edge of this equivalences's sequence is a limit of an $\subseteq$-increasing continuous sequence of subsets of cardinality less than λ, and it is equal to M_α [Why is the sequence in the right edge, $\langle \bigcup\{M_{\beta,\varepsilon} : \beta < \alpha\} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$ continuous? Let $\varepsilon < \lambda^+$ be a limit ordinal. Suppose $x \in \bigcup\{M_{\beta,\varepsilon} : \beta < \alpha\}$. Then there are ζ, β such that $x \in M_{\beta,\zeta}$. So $x \in \bigcup\{M_{\beta,\zeta} : \beta < \alpha\}]$. So there is a club $E_{\alpha,1} \subseteq \lambda^+$ such that $\varepsilon \in E_{\alpha,1} \Rightarrow M_{\alpha,\varepsilon} = \bigcup\{M_{\beta,\varepsilon} : \beta < \alpha\}$. For α limit define $E_\alpha := E_{\alpha,0} \bigcap E_{\alpha,1}$, and for α not limit define $E_\alpha := E_{\alpha,0}$.

Case a: $\delta < \lambda^+$. Define $E := \bigcap\{E_\alpha : \alpha < \delta\}$. If $\varepsilon \in E$ then for $\alpha < \delta$, $\varepsilon \in E$, so $NF(M_{\alpha,\varepsilon}, M_{\alpha,Min(E-(\varepsilon+1))}, M_{\alpha+1,\varepsilon}, M_{\alpha+1,\mathrm{Min}(E-(\varepsilon+1))})$. So be Theorem 5.25 (the long transitivity theorem), $\varepsilon \in E \Rightarrow NF(M_{0,\varepsilon}, M_{0,\mathrm{Min}(E-(\varepsilon+1))}, M_{\delta,\varepsilon}, M_{\delta,\mathrm{Min}(E-(\varepsilon+1))})$. Hence $M_0 \preceq^{NF} M_1$.

Case b: $\delta = \lambda^+$. Let $E := \{\varepsilon \in E : \varepsilon$ is a limit ordinal, $\alpha < \varepsilon \Rightarrow \varepsilon \in E_\alpha\}$. Denote $N_\varepsilon := \bigcup\{M_{\alpha,\varepsilon} : \alpha < \varepsilon\}$.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
M_0 \arrow[r, "id"] & M_\alpha \arrow[r, "id"] & M_\varepsilon \arrow[r, "id"] & M_\zeta \arrow[r, "id"] & M_{\lambda^+} \\
M_{0,\zeta} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_{\alpha,\zeta} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_{\varepsilon,\zeta} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & N_\zeta \arrow[u, "id"] & \\
M_{0,\varepsilon} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & M_{\alpha,\varepsilon} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & N_\varepsilon \arrow[u, "id"] & & \\
M_{0,\alpha} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & N_\alpha \arrow[u, "id"] & & & \\
M_{0,0} \arrow[u, "id"] & & & &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Claim 6.6. *For every $\varepsilon \in E$ the sequence $\langle M_{\alpha,\varepsilon} : \alpha < \varepsilon\rangle^\frown\langle N_\varepsilon\rangle$ is increasing and continuous (especially $N_\varepsilon \in K$),*

Proof. If $\varepsilon \in E$ is limit, then $\alpha < \varepsilon \Rightarrow \varepsilon \in E_{\alpha,1}$, so the sequence $\langle M_{\alpha,\varepsilon} : \alpha < \varepsilon\rangle$ is continuous. So it is sufficient to prove that $\alpha < \varepsilon \Rightarrow M_{\alpha,\varepsilon} \preceq M_{\alpha,\varepsilon+1}$. Suppose $\alpha < \varepsilon$. $\varepsilon \in E$, so $\varepsilon \in E_{\alpha,0}$. Hence $NF(M_{\alpha,\varepsilon}, M_{\alpha+1,\varepsilon}, M_{\alpha,\mathrm{Min}(E-(\varepsilon+1))}, M_{\alpha+1,\mathrm{Min}(E-(\varepsilon+1))})$, and especially $M_{\alpha,\varepsilon} \preceq M_{\alpha+1,\varepsilon}$. ⊣

Claim 6.7. *The sequence $\langle N_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \in E\rangle$ is $\preceq$-increasing.*

Proof. Suppose $\varepsilon < \zeta$, $\{\varepsilon, \zeta\} \subseteq E$. By (*), the sequences $\langle M_{\alpha,\varepsilon} : \alpha < \varepsilon\rangle^\frown\langle N_\varepsilon\rangle, \langle M_{\alpha,\zeta} : \alpha \leq \varepsilon\rangle$ are increasing and continuous. For every $\alpha \in \varepsilon$ the sequence $\langle M_{\alpha,\beta} : \beta < \lambda^+\rangle$ is a representation of M_α, and especially it is $\preceq$-increasing. So $(\forall \alpha \in \varepsilon) M_{\alpha,\varepsilon} \preceq M_{\alpha,\zeta}$. Hence by the smoothness $N_\varepsilon \preceq M_{\varepsilon,\zeta}$. But by (*), $M_{\varepsilon,\zeta} \preceq N_\zeta$, so $N_\varepsilon \preceq N_\zeta$.]

⊣

Claim 6.8. *The sequence $\langle N_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \in E\rangle$ is continuous*

Proof. Suppose $\varepsilon = sup(E \bigcap \varepsilon)$. Let $x \in N_\varepsilon$. By the definition of N_ε there is $\alpha < \varepsilon$ such that $x \in M_{\alpha,\varepsilon}$. ε is limit and the sequence $\langle M_{\alpha,\beta} : \beta \leq \varepsilon\rangle$ is continuous. So there is $\beta < \varepsilon$ such that $x \in M_{\alpha,\beta}$. $\varepsilon = sup(E \bigcap \varepsilon)$, so there is $\zeta \in (\beta, \varepsilon) \bigcap E$. $x \in M_{\alpha,\zeta}$ but by (*), $M_{\alpha,\zeta} \subseteq N_\zeta$, so $x \in N_\zeta$]. $\dashv$

Claim 6.9. $\bigcup\{N_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \in E\} = M_\delta$

Proof. Clearly $\bigcup\{N_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \in E\} \subseteq M_\delta$. The other inclusion: Let $x \in M_\delta$. Then there is $\alpha < \delta$ such that $x \in M_\alpha$. So $(\exists \alpha, \beta) x \in M_{\alpha,\beta}$. So as $sup(E) = \delta$, There is $\zeta \in (\beta, \delta) \bigcap E$. So $x \in M_{\alpha,\zeta}$ which by (*) is $\subseteq N_\zeta$. So $x \in N_\zeta$]. $\dashv$

Claim 6.10. *If* $\varepsilon < \zeta$, $\{\varepsilon, \zeta\} \subseteq E$ *then* $NF(M_{0,\varepsilon}, N_\varepsilon, M_{0,\zeta}, N_\zeta)$

Proof. By the definition of E, $(\forall \alpha \in \varepsilon)\{\varepsilon, \zeta\} \subseteq E_\alpha$. So $(\forall \alpha \in \varepsilon) NF(M_{\alpha,\varepsilon}, M_{\alpha+1,\varepsilon}, M_{\alpha,\zeta}, M_{\alpha+1,\zeta})$. By (*), the sequences $\langle M_{\alpha,\varepsilon} : \alpha < \varepsilon\rangle^\frown\langle N_\varepsilon\rangle$, $\langle M_{\alpha,\zeta} : \alpha \leq \varepsilon\rangle$ are increasing and continuous. So by Theorem 5.25 (the long transitivity theorem), $NF(M_{0,\varepsilon}, N_\varepsilon, M_{0,\zeta}, M_{\varepsilon,\zeta})$. But by Claim 6.6 $M_{\varepsilon,\zeta} \prec N_\zeta$, so $NF(M_{0,\varepsilon}, N_\varepsilon, M_{0,\zeta}, N_\zeta)$]. $\dashv$

By Claims 6.7,6.8,6.9, the sequence $\langle N_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \delta\rangle$ is a representation of M_δ. The sequence $\langle M_{0,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$ is a representation of M_0. Hence, by Claim 6.10 and item a, they witness that $M_0 \preceq^{NF} M_\delta$.

(e) By Proposition 6.3.c. Derived also by the existence proposition of the $\prec^+$-extension, (Proposition 7.12.f), which we will prove later.

(f) We have actually proved it, (for example: axiom 1.1.1.e by item c here and axiom 1.1.1.c. By item d here).

(g) Let $\langle N_{0,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$, $\langle N_{1,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$ be witnesses for $M_0 \preceq^{NF} M_1$. By cardinality considerations there is $\varepsilon \in \lambda^+$ such that for $n < 2$ we have $A_n \subseteq N_{n,\varepsilon}$. But for every $\varepsilon < \lambda^+$, $\widehat{NF}(N_{0,\varepsilon}, N_{1,\varepsilon}, M_0, M_1)$. $\dashv$

7. $\prec^+$ AND SATURATED MODELS

Hypothesis 7.1. $\mathfrak{s}$ is a weakly successful semi-good λ-frame with conjugation.

Definition 7.2. K^{sat} is the class of saturated models in λ^+ over λ.

Now we study the class $(K^{sat}, \preceq^{NF}\restriction K^{sat})$. Note that in the following theorem there is no any set-theoretic hypothesis beyond ZFC.

Theorem 7.3. *If ($\mathfrak{s}$ is a weakly successful semi-good λ-frame with conjugation and) $(K^{sat}, \preceq^{NF}\restriction K^{sat})$ does not satisfy smoothness (see Definition 1.1.1.d), then there are $2^{\lambda^{+2}}$ pairwise non-isomorphic models in $K_{\lambda^{+2}}$.*

How can we prove this theorem? First we find a relation $\prec^+$ on K_{λ^+} such that:

- (*) For every model M_0 in K_{λ^+} there is a model M_1 such that $M_0 \prec^+ M_1$.
- (**) If for $n = 1, 2$ $M_0 \prec^+ M_n$ then M_1, M_2 are isomorphic over M_0.
- (***) If $\langle M_i : i \leq \alpha^*\rangle$ is an increasing continuous sequence, and $i < \alpha^* \Rightarrow M_i \prec^+ M_{i+1}$ then $M_0 \prec^+ M_{\alpha^*}$.

In section 7 we study the properties of $\prec^+$. Sections 8,9 are preparations for the proof of Theorem 7.3. A key theorem is Theorem 9.7: Suppose that there is an increasing continuous sequence $\langle M^*_\alpha : \alpha \leq \lambda + 1\rangle$ of models in K^{sat} such that: $\alpha < \beta < \lambda^+ \Rightarrow M^*_\alpha \prec^+ M^*_\beta \wedge M^*_\alpha \preceq^{NF} M_{\lambda^+ +1}$ and $M^*_{\lambda^+} \npreceq^{NF} M^*_{\lambda^+ +1}$. Then for every $S \in S^{\lambda^{+2}}_{\lambda^+} := \{S : S$ is a stationary subset of λ^{+2} and $(\forall \alpha \in S)cf(\alpha) = \lambda^+\}$, there is a model M^S in $K_{\lambda^{+2}}$ such that $S(M^S) = S/D_{\lambda^{+2}}$. So there are $2^{\lambda^{+2}}$ pairwise non-isomorphic models in $K_{\lambda^{+2}}$.

Note that while $\prec^+$ is a priori defined on K_{λ^+}, Proposition 7.6 shows that any $\prec^+$ extension is saturated in λ^+ over λ, so in K^{sat}.

Definition 7.4. $\prec^+$ is a 2-place relation on K_{λ^+}. For $M_0, M_1 \in K_{\lambda^+}$, we say $M_0 \prec^+ M_1$ iff: there are increasing continuous sequences $\langle N_{0,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+\rangle$, $\langle N_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+\rangle$, $\langle N^{\oplus}_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+\rangle$, and there is a club E of λ^+ such that:

(a) For $n = 1, 2$ $M_n = \bigcup\{N_{n,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+\}$.
(b) $\alpha \in E \Rightarrow N_{0,\alpha} \preceq N_{1,\alpha} \preceq N^{\oplus}_{1,\alpha}$.
(c) If $\alpha < \beta$ and they are in E, then $NF(N_{0,\alpha}, N^{\oplus}_{1,\alpha}, N_{0,\beta}, N_{1,\beta})$.
(d) For every $\alpha \in E$, and every $p \in S^{bs}(N_{1,\alpha})$, there is an end-segment S of λ^+ such that for every $\beta \in S \bigcap E$ the model $N^{\oplus}_{1,\beta}$ realizes the non-forking extension of p to $N_{1,\beta}$.

In such a case $\langle N_{0,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+\rangle$, $\langle N_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+\rangle$, $\langle N^{\oplus}_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+\rangle$, E are said to be witnesses for $M_0 \prec^+ M_1$.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
M_0 \arrow[rrrrrr, "id"] & & & & & & M_1 \\
N_{0,3} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[rrrr, "id"] & & & & N_{1,3} \arrow[r, "id"] & N^{\oplus}_{1,3} \arrow[ur, "id"] & \\
N_{0,2} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[rrr, "id"] & & & N_{1,2} \arrow[r, "id"] & N^{\oplus}_{1,2} \arrow[u, "id"] & & \\
N_{0,1} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[rr, "id"] & & N_{1,1} \arrow[r, "id"] & N^{\oplus}_{1,1} \arrow[u, "id"] & & & \\
N_{0,0} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & N_{1,0} \arrow[r, "id"] & N^{\oplus}_{1,0} \arrow[u, "id"] & & & &
\end{tikzcd}$$

By the following proposition if $M_0 \prec^+ M_1$ then we can find witnesses for it, with $E = \lambda^+$.

Proposition 7.5. *If*

(1) $\langle N_{0,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$, $\langle N_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$, $\langle N^{\oplus}_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$, E *are witnesses for* $M_0 \prec^+ M_1$.

(2) For $\alpha \in E$ $M_{0,otp(\alpha \bigcap E)} = N_{0,\alpha}$, $M_{1,otp(\alpha \bigcap E)} = N_{1,\alpha}$, $M^{\oplus}_{1,otp(\alpha \bigcap E)} = N^{\oplus}_{1,\alpha}$.

then $\langle M_{0,\beta} : \beta < \lambda^+ \rangle$, $\langle M_{1,\beta} : \beta < \lambda^+ \rangle$, $\langle M^{\oplus}_{1,\beta} : \beta < \lambda^+ \rangle$, λ^+ *are witnesses for* $M_0 \prec^+ M_1$.

Proof. Easy, so we prove Definition 7.4.c only. Suppose $\gamma_0 < \gamma_1$. We have to prove that $NF(M_{0,\gamma_0}, M^{\oplus}_{1,\gamma_0}, M_{0,\gamma_1}, M_{1,\gamma_1})$. There is a unique ordinal $\alpha \in E$ with $otp(\alpha \bigcap E) = \gamma_0$. So $M_{0,\gamma_0} = N_{0,\alpha} \wedge M^{\oplus}_{1,\gamma_0} = N^{\oplus}_{1,\alpha}$. Similarly there is a unique $\beta \in E$ such that $M_{0,\gamma_1} = N_{0,\beta} \wedge M_{1,\gamma_1} = N_{1,\beta}$. Now by clause b in the assumption $NF(N_{0,\alpha}, N^{\oplus}_{1,\alpha}, N_{0,\beta}, N_{1,\beta})$, namely $NF(M_{0,\gamma_0}, M^{\oplus}_{1,\gamma_0}, N_{0,\gamma_1}, N_{1,\gamma_1})$. ⊣

Proposition 7.6. *If* $\langle N_{0,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$, $\langle N_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$, $\langle N^{\oplus}_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$, E *are witnesses for* $M_0 \prec^+ M_1$ *and* E^- *is a club of* λ^+ *with* $E^- \subseteq E$ *then* $\langle N_{0,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$, $\langle N_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$, $\langle N^{\oplus}_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$, E^- *are witnesses for* $M_0 \prec^+ M_1$.

Proof. Trivial. ⊣

Proposition 7.7. *Suppose:*

(a) For $n = 1, 2$ $NF(M_{0,0}, M_{0,1}, M_{n,0}, M_{n,1})$.
(b) $M_{1,0} \preceq N_0$, $M_{2,0} \preceq N_0$.
(c) $N_0 \bigcap M_{0,1} = M_{0,0}$.

Then for some model N_1 *with* $NF(M_{0,0}, M_{0,1}, N_0, N_1)$ *we can assign to each* $n \in \{1, 2\}$ *an embedding* $f_n : M_{n,1} \to N_1$ *over* $M_{0,1} \bigcup M_{n,0}$ *such that* $NF(M_{n,0}, f_n[M_{n,1}], N_0, N_1)$.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & N_0 \arrow[rr, "id"] & & N_1 \\
M_{2,0} \arrow[ur, "id"] \arrow[rr, "id"] & & M_{2,1} \arrow[ur, "f_2"] & \\
 & M_{1,0} \arrow[uu, "id"] \arrow[rr, "id"] & & M_{1,1} \arrow[uu, "f_1"] \\
M_{0,0} \arrow[uu, "id"] \arrow[ur, "id"] \arrow[rr, "id"] & & M_{0,1} \arrow[uu, "id"] \arrow[ur, "id"] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Proof. For each $n \in \{1, 2\}$ by Theorem 5.11 (the existence theorem for NF), we can find an amalgamation $(id_{N_0}, g_n, N_{n,1})$ of $N_0, M_{n,1}$ over $M_{n,0}$ with

$NF(M_{n,0}, N_0, g_n[M_{n,1}], N_{n,1})$. But $NF(M_{0,0}, M_{n,0}, M_{0,1}, M_{n,1})$. So by Theorem 5.25 (the long transitivity theorem) $NF(M_{0,0}, N_0, g_n[M_{0,1}], N_{n,1})$. By assumption c $N_0 \bigcap M_{0,1} = M_{0,0}$. So by Theorem 5.20 (the weak uniqueness theorem) we can find h_1, h_2, N_1 such that the following hold:

1. $h_n : N_{n,1} \to N_1$ is an embedding.
2. $h_n \restriction N_0 = id_{N_0}$.
3. $h_1 \circ g_1 \restriction M_{0,1} = h_1 \circ g_2 \restriction M_{0,1} = id_{M_{0,1}}$.

Now we define for $n = 1, 2$ $f_n := h_n \circ g_n$. Why is f_n over $M_{0,1} \bigcup M_{n,0}$? By clause 3 $x \in M_{0,1} \Rightarrow f_n(x) = x$. Let $x \in M_{n,0}$. Then $g_n(x) = x$. By assumption b $M_{n,0} \subseteq N_0$, so $x \in N_0$. So by clause 2 $h_n(x) = x$. Hence $f_n(x) = h_n(g_n(x)) = h_n(x) = x$.

Claim 7.8. *$NF(M_{n,0}, f_n[M_{n,1}], N_0, N_1)$.*

Proof. $NF(M_{n,0}, N_0, g_n[M_{n,1}], N_{n,1})$. So by clauses 1,2 $NF(M_{n,0}, N_0, f_n [M_{n,1}], h_n[N_{n,1}])$. But $h_n[N_{n,1}] \preceq N_1$, so $NF(M_{n,0}, N_0, f_n[M_{n,1}], N_1)$. ⊣

Claim 7.9. *$NF(M_{0,0}, M_{0,1}, N_0, N_1)$.*

Proof. Since $NF(M_{1,0}, M_{1,1}, N_0, N_1)$, by Theorem 5.25 (the long transitivity theorem) it is enough to prove that $NF(M_{0,0}, M_{0,1}, M_{1,0}, f_1[M_{1,1}])$. But f_n is over $M_{0,1} \bigcup M_{1,0}$. Hence it follows by assumption a. ⊣

⊣

Proposition 7.10.

(a) If $M_0 \prec^+ M_1$ then $M_0 \prec^{NF} M_1$.
(b) If $M_0 \prec^+ M_1$ then $M_1 \in K^{sat}$.
(c) If $M_0 \preceq^{NF} M_1 \prec^+ M_2$ then $M_0 \prec^+ M_2$.
(d) If $M_0 \prec^+ M_1 \prec^+ M_2$ then $M_0 \prec^+ M_2$.

Proof.

(a) If $\langle N_{0,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$, $\langle N_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$, $\langle N_{2,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$, E witness that $M_0 \prec^+ M_1$ then $\langle N_{0,\alpha} : \alpha \in E \rangle$, $\langle N_{1,\alpha} : \alpha \in E \rangle$ witness that $\widehat{NF}(N_{0,0}, N_{1,0}, M_0, M_1)$. So $M_0 \preceq^{NF} M_1$.
(b) By Theorem 2.17.2 (page 16).
(c) Easy.
(d) By items a,c.

⊣

Definition 7.11. The $\prec^+$-*game* is a game between two players. It lasts λ^+ moves. In any move the players choose models in K_λ with the following rules:

The 0 move: Player 1 chooses models $N_{0,0}, N_{1,0} \in K_\lambda$ with $N_{0,0} \preceq N_{1,0}$ and player 2 does not do anything.

The α move where α is limit: Player 1 must choose $N_{0,\alpha} := \bigcup\{N_{0,\beta} : \beta < \alpha\}$ and Player 2 must choose $N_{1,\alpha} := \bigcup\{N_{1,\beta} : \beta < \alpha\}$.

The $\alpha + 1$ move: Player 1 chooses a model $N_{0,\alpha+1}$ such that the following hold:

(1) $N_{0,\alpha} \preceq N_{0,\alpha+1}$.
(2) $N_{0,\alpha+1} \bigcap N_{1,\alpha} = N_{0,\alpha}$.

After player one chooses $N_{0,\alpha+1}$, player 2 has to choose $N_{1,\alpha+1}$ such that the following hold:

(1) $N_{1,\alpha} \preceq N_{1,\alpha+1}$.
(2) $NF(N_{0,\alpha}, N_{1,\alpha}, N_{0,\alpha+1}, N_{1,\alpha+1})$.

In the end of the game, player 2 wins the game if $\bigcup\{N_{0,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+\} \prec^+ \bigcup\{N_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+\}$.

A *strategy for player 2* is a function F that assigns a model $N_{1,\alpha+1}$ to each triple $(\alpha, \langle N_{0,\beta} : \beta \leq \alpha+1\rangle, \langle N_{1,\beta} : \beta \leq \alpha\rangle)$ that satisfies the following conditions:

(1) $\alpha < \lambda^+$.
(2) $\langle N_{0,\beta} : \beta \leq \alpha+1\rangle$, $\langle N_{1,\beta} : \beta \leq \alpha\rangle$ are increasing continuous sequences of models in K_λ.
(3) $NF(N_{0,\alpha}, N_{1,\alpha}, N_{0,\alpha+1}, N_{1,\alpha+1})$ for $\beta < \alpha$.
(4) $N_{0,\alpha+1} \bigcap N_{1,\alpha} = N_{0,\alpha}$.

A *winning strategy for player 2* is a strategy for player 2, such that if player 2 acts by it, then he wins the game, no matter what does player 1 do.

Proposition 7.12.
(a) For every $M_0 \in K_{\lambda^+}$ there is M_1 with $M_0 \prec^+ M_1$.
(b) If $M_0 \in K_{\lambda^+}$, $n < 2 \Rightarrow N_n \in K_\lambda$, $N_0 \prec M_0$, $N_0 \prec N_1$, $N_1 \bigcap M_0 = N_0$, then there is M_1 such that $M_0 \prec^+ M_1$ and $\widehat{NF}(N_0, N_1, M_0, M_1)$.
(c) Player 2 has a winning strategy in the $\prec^+$-game.

Proof. (a) By c.
(b) By c.
(c) We describe a strategy: For $\alpha = 0$ player 2 has nothing to do, but he takes a paper and writes for himself: I define $N^{temp}_{1,0} := N_{1,0}$. For α limit player 2 chooses $N_{1,\alpha} := \bigcup\{N_{1,\beta} : \beta < \alpha\}$ and writes for himself $N^{temp}_{1,\alpha} := N_{1,\alpha}$. In the $\alpha+1$ move, he writes for himself 3 things:

(i) A model $N^{temp}_{1,\alpha+1}$ with $NF(N_{0,\alpha}, N_{1,\alpha}, N_{0,\alpha+1}, N^{temp}_{1,\alpha+1})$. By Theorem 5.11.a (on page 40) it is possible.
(ii) A sequence of types $\langle p_{\alpha,\beta} : \beta < \lambda^+\rangle$ that includes $S^{bs}(N^{temp}_{1,\alpha})$.

Now player 2 chooses a model $N_{1,\alpha+1}$ such that the following hold:

(1) $N^{temp}_{1,\alpha+1} \preceq N_{1,\alpha+1}$.
(2) For each type in $p_{\gamma,\beta}$ with $\gamma < \alpha$, $\beta < \alpha$, $N_{1,\alpha+1}$ realizes the non-forking extension of $p_{\gamma,\beta}$ over $N^{temp}_{1,\alpha+1}$.

By Proposition 1.25 (page 7) it is possible.

Why shall player 2 win the game? Substitute the sequences $\langle N_{0,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+\rangle$, $\langle N^{temp}_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+\rangle$, $\langle N_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+\rangle$ which appear here instead of the sequences $\langle N_{0,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+\rangle$, $\langle N_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+\rangle$, $\langle N^{\oplus}_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+\rangle$ in Definition 7.4, and substitute $E = \lambda^+$. ⊣

Roughly the following theorem says that:

(a) The $\prec^+$-extension is unique.

(b) Locality: Every type over a model in K_{λ^+} is determined by its restrictions to submodels in K_λ.

(c) A preparation for symmetry.

Theorem 7.13. *Suppose for $n = 1, 2$ $M_0 \prec^+ M_n$ then:*

(a) M_1, M_2 are isomorphic over M_0.

(b) For every $a_1 \in M_1$, $a_2 \in M_2$ if for each $N \in K_\lambda$ with $N \preceq M_0$ $tp(a_1, N, M_1) = tp(a_2, N, M_2)$ then there is an isomorphism $f : M_1 \to M_2$ over M_0 with $f(a_1) = a_2$.

(c) Let $N^* \in K_\lambda$, $N_0 \preceq N^*$. If for $n = 1, 2$ $\widehat{NF}(N_0, N^*, M_0, M_n)$, then there is an isomorphism $f : M_1 \to M_2$ over $M_0 \bigcup N^*$.

The plan of the proof: We prove the three items at once. The proof is similar to that of the uniqueness of the saturated model in λ^+ over λ. Suppose $\langle N_{0,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$, $\langle N_{1,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$, $\langle N^{\oplus}_{1,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$, λ^+ witness that $M_0 \prec^+ M_1$. So $\langle N_{0,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$ is a representation of M_0 and $\langle N_{1,0}, N^{\oplus}_{1,0}, N_{1,1}, N^{\oplus}_{1,1}, ...N_{1,\omega}, N^{\oplus}_{1,\omega}...\rangle$ is a representation of M_1. Suppose in addition that $\langle N_{0,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$, $\langle N_{2,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$, $\langle N^{\oplus}_{2,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$, λ^+ witness that $M_0 \prec^+ M_2$. We amalgamate M_1, M_2 over M_0 in λ^+ steps. In each step we amalgamate the corresponding models in the representations of M_1, M_2 over the corresponding model in the representation of M_0. Now if (f_1, f_2, M_3) is an amalgamation of M_1, M_2 over M_0 and f_1, f_2 are onto M_3, then $f_2^{-1} \circ f_1$ is an isomorphism of M_1 into M_2 over M_0 as required. In odd steps we choose the amalgamations such that in the end f_1, f_2 will be onto M_3, see requirement 8 below. In even steps we choose amalgamations with NF, see requirement 4 below.

Proof. Roughly, the following claim says that one representation of M_0 can serve as a part of the witness to $M_0 \prec^+ M_1$ and $M_0 \prec^+ M_2$ together.

Claim 7.14. *There are sequences $\langle N_{0,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$, $\langle N_{1,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$, $\langle N^{\oplus}_{1,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$, $\langle N_{2,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$, $\langle N^{\oplus}_{2,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$ such that for $n = 1, 2$ $\langle N_{0,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$, $\langle N_{n,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$, $E = \lambda^+$, $\langle N^{\oplus}_{n,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$ witnesses that $M_0 \prec^+ M_n$ (so $\bigcup\{N_{0,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\} = M_0$ and for $n = 1, 2$ $\bigcup\{N_{n,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\} = \bigcup\{N^{\oplus}_{n,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\} = M_n$).*

Proof. For $n = 1, 2$ we take witnesses $\langle N^{temp}_{0,n,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$, $\langle N^{temp}_{n,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$, $\langle N^{\oplus,temp}_{n,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$, E_n for $M_0 \prec^+ M_n$. Take a club E of λ^+ such that $E \subseteq E_1 \bigcap E_2$ and $\varepsilon \in E \Rightarrow N^{temp}_{0,1,\varepsilon} = N^{temp}_{0,2,\varepsilon}$. By Proposition 7.6 for $n = 1, 2$ $\langle N^{temp}_{0,n,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$, $\langle N^{temp}_{n,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$, $\langle N^{\oplus,temp}_{n,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$, E are witnesses for $M_0 \prec^+ M_n$. Define $N_{0,otp(\varepsilon \bigcap E)} := N^{temp}_{0,1,\varepsilon)}$. For $n = 1, 2$ and $\varepsilon \in E$, define $N_{n,otp(\varepsilon \bigcap E)} := N^{temp}_{n,\varepsilon}$. By Proposition 7.5 for $n = 1, 2$

$\langle N_{0,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+ \rangle$, $\langle N_{n,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+ \rangle$, $E = \lambda^+$, $\langle N^{\oplus}_{n,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+ \rangle$ witness that $M_0 \prec^+ M_n$. $\dashv$

For item b, we require in addition that $a_n \in N_{n,0}$ and $tp(a_1, N_{0,0}, N_{1,0}) = tp(a_2, N_{0,0}, N_{2,0})$. For item c, we require in addition that $NF(N_0, N^*, N_{0,0}, N_{n,0})$.

Define by induction on $\varepsilon \leq \lambda^+$ a triple $(N_\varepsilon, f_{1,\varepsilon}, f_{2,\varepsilon})$ such that:

1. $\langle N_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \leq \lambda^+ \rangle$ is an increasing continuous sequence of models in K_λ and for every $\varepsilon < \lambda^+$ $N_{2\varepsilon} \bigcap M_0 = N_{2\varepsilon+1} \bigcap M_0 = N_{0,\varepsilon}$.
2. For item c we add: $f_{n,0} \restriction N^*$ is the identity.
3. For item b we add: $f_{1,0}(a_1) = f_{2,0}(a_2)$.
4. $\varepsilon < \lambda^+ \Rightarrow NF(N_{0,\varepsilon}, N_{2\varepsilon+1}, N_{0,\varepsilon+1}, N_{2\varepsilon+2})$.
5. For $n = 1, 2$ the sequence $\langle f_{n,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon \leq \lambda^+ \rangle$ is increasing and continuous.
6. For $\varepsilon < \lambda^+$, $f_{n,2\varepsilon}$ is an embedding of $N_{n,\varepsilon}$ to $N_{2\varepsilon}$ and $f_{n,2\varepsilon+1}$ is an embedding of $N^{\oplus}_{n,\varepsilon}$ to $N_{2\varepsilon+1}$.
7. $f_{n,2\varepsilon} \restriction N_{0,\varepsilon} = f_{n,2\varepsilon+1} \restriction N_{0,\varepsilon}$ and it is the identity on $N_{0,\varepsilon}$.
8. For every $\varepsilon < \lambda^+$ if for some $n \in \{1, 2\}$ $(*)_{n,\varepsilon}$ holds then for some $m \in \{1, 2\}$ $(**)_{m,\varepsilon}$ holds, where:
   $(*)_{n,\varepsilon}$ There is $p \in S^{bs}(N_{n,\varepsilon})$ such that p is realized in $N^{\oplus}_{n,\varepsilon}$ and $f_{n,2\varepsilon}(p)$ is realized in $N_{2\varepsilon}$.
   $(**)_{m,\varepsilon}$, $f_{m,2\varepsilon+1}[N^{\oplus}_{m,\varepsilon}] \bigcap N_{2\varepsilon} \neq f_{m,2\varepsilon}[N_{m,\varepsilon}]$.

Note that requirement 4 is essentially a property of $N_{2\varepsilon+2}$ and $(**)_{m,\varepsilon}$ is essentially a property of $f_{m,2\varepsilon+1}$.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & & N^{\oplus}_{1,\varepsilon+1} \arrow[rrr, "f_{1,2\varepsilon+3}"] & & & N_{2\varepsilon+3} \\
 & N_{1,\varepsilon+1} \arrow[ur, "id"] \arrow[rrrr, "f_{1,2\varepsilon+2}"] & & & & N_{2\varepsilon+2} \arrow[u, "id"'] \\
N_{0,\varepsilon+1} \arrow[ur, "id"] \arrow[rrr, "id"] & & & N_{2,\varepsilon+1} \arrow[r, "id"] \arrow[urr, "f_{2,2\varepsilon+2}"] & N^{\oplus}_{2,\varepsilon+1} \arrow[uur, "f_{2,2\varepsilon+3}"'] & \\
 & & N^{\oplus}_{1,\varepsilon} \arrow[uuu, "id"] \arrow[rrr, "f_{1,2\varepsilon+1}"] & & & N_{2\varepsilon+1} \arrow[uu, "id"'] \\
 & N_{1,\varepsilon} \arrow[ur, "id"] \arrow[uuu, "id"] \arrow[rrrr, "f_{1,2\varepsilon}"] & & & & N_{2\varepsilon} \arrow[u, "id"'] \\
N_{0,\varepsilon} \arrow[uuu, "id"] \arrow[ur, "id"] \arrow[rrr, "id"] & & & N_{2,\varepsilon} \arrow[uuu, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] \arrow[urr, "f_{2,2\varepsilon}"] & N^{\oplus}_{2,\varepsilon} \arrow[uuu, "id"] \arrow[uur, "f_{2,2\varepsilon+1}"'] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Why can we carry out the construction? For $\varepsilon = 0$ let $(f_{1,0}, f_{2,0}, N_0)$ be an amalgamation of $N_{1,0}, N_{2,0}$ over $N_{0,0}$, such that $N_0 \bigcap M_0 = N_{0,0}$ (i.e. we choose new elements for $N_0 - N_{0,0}$). In the proof of item b, by the definition of the equality between types without loss of generality $f_{1,0}(a_1) = f_{2,0}(a_2)$, so 3 is satisfied. In the proof of item c, by Theorem 5.20 (the weak uniqueness theorem of NF), there is a joint embedding $f_{1,0}, f_{2,0}, N_0$ of $N_{1,0}, N_{2,0}$ over $N_{0,0} \bigcup N^*$. So 2 is satisfied.

For *limit* ε define $N_\varepsilon = \bigcup\{N_\zeta : \zeta < \varepsilon\}$, $f_{n,\varepsilon} = \bigcup\{f_{n,\zeta} : \zeta < \varepsilon\}$. 5 is satisfied. 1 is satisfied by axiom 1.1.1.c. 6 is satisfied by the continuity of the sequence $\langle N_{n,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$, and by the smoothness (Definition 1.1.1.d). Clearly 7 is satisfied. 4,8 are not relevant in the limit case.

The successor case: How can we construct $N_{2\varepsilon+1}, f_{1,2\varepsilon+1}, f_{2,2\varepsilon+1}$ and $N_{2\varepsilon+2}, f_{1,2\varepsilon+2}, f_{2,2\varepsilon+2}$, assuming we have constructed $N_{2\varepsilon}, f_{1,2\varepsilon}, f_{2,2\varepsilon}$?

The construction of $N_{2\varepsilon+1}, f_{1,2\varepsilon+1}, f_{2,2\varepsilon+1}$: Without loss of generality for some $n \in 1, 2$, we have $(*)_{n,\varepsilon}$ [Otherwise requirement 8 is not relevant and we can use the existence of an amalgamation in $(K_\lambda, \preceq)$]. Fix n^* with $(*)_{n^*,\varepsilon}$. We are going to find $N_{2\varepsilon+1}, f_{n^*,2\varepsilon+1}, f_{3-n^*,2\varepsilon+1}$ with $(**)_{n^*,\varepsilon}$, namely $f_{n^*,2\varepsilon+1}[N^{\oplus}_{n^*,\varepsilon}] \bigcap N_{2\varepsilon} \neq f_{n^*,2\varepsilon}[N_{n^*,\varepsilon}]$. Let p be a witness for $(*)_{n^*,\varepsilon}$, so for some a, b $tp(a, N_{n^*,\varepsilon}, N^{\oplus}_{n^*,\varepsilon}) = p$, $tp(b, f_{n^*,2\varepsilon}[N_{n^*,\varepsilon}], N_{2\varepsilon}) = f_{n^*,2\varepsilon}(p)$. So $tp(f_{n^*,2\varepsilon}(a), f_{n^*,2\varepsilon}[N_{n^*,\varepsilon}], f_{n^*,2\varepsilon}[N^{\oplus}_{n^*,\varepsilon}]) = tp(b, f_{n^*,2\varepsilon}[N_{n^*,\varepsilon}], N_{2\varepsilon})$. Hence by the definition of equality of types, for some $N^{temp}_{2\varepsilon+1}, f^{temp}_{n^*,2\varepsilon+1}$ the following hold:

(1) $N_{2\varepsilon} \preceq N^{temp}_{2\varepsilon+1}$.
(2) $f^{temp}_{n^*,2\varepsilon+1} : N^{\oplus}_{n^*,\varepsilon} \to N^{temp}_{2\varepsilon+1}$ is an embedding.
(3) $f_{n^*,2\varepsilon} \subseteq f^{temp}_{n^*,2\varepsilon+1}$
(4) $f^{temp}_{n^*,2\varepsilon+1}(a) = b$.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & N^{\oplus}_{3-n^*,\varepsilon} \arrow[rr, "f_{3-n^*,2\varepsilon+1}"] & & N_{2\varepsilon+1} \\
 & & a \in N^{\oplus}_{n^*,\varepsilon} \arrow[ur, "f_{n^*,2\varepsilon+1}"] \arrow[r, "f^{temp}_{n^*,2\varepsilon+1}"'] & N^{temp}_{2\varepsilon+1} \arrow[u, "id"'] \\
 & N_{3-n^*,\varepsilon} \arrow[uu, "id"] \arrow[ur, "id"] \arrow[rr, "f_{3-n^*,2\varepsilon}"] & & N_{2\varepsilon} \ni b \arrow[u, "id"'] \\
N_{0,\varepsilon} \arrow[ur, "id"] \arrow[rr, "id"] & & N_{n^*,\varepsilon} \arrow[uu, "id"] \arrow[ur, "f_{n^*,2\varepsilon}"] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Claim 7.15. $f^{temp}_{n^*,2\varepsilon+1}[N^{\oplus}_{n^*,\varepsilon}] \bigcap N_{2\varepsilon} \neq f^{temp}_{n^*,2\varepsilon}[N_{n^*,\varepsilon}]$.

Proof. $b \in N_{2\varepsilon}$. p is a basic type so a non-algebraic one. So $a \in N^{\oplus}_{n^*,\varepsilon} - N_{n^*,\varepsilon}$. Hence $b = f^{temp}_{n^*,2\varepsilon+1}(a) \in f^{temp}_{n^*,2\varepsilon+1}[N^{\oplus}_{n^*,\varepsilon}] - f^{temp}_{n^*,2\varepsilon+1}[N_{n^*,\varepsilon}]$. Therefore $b \in f^{temp}_{n^*,2\varepsilon+1}[N^{\oplus}_{n^*,\varepsilon}] \bigcap N_{2\varepsilon} - f^{temp}_{n^*,2\varepsilon}[N_{n^*,\varepsilon}]$. $\dashv$

As $(K_\lambda, \preceq)$ satisfies amalgamation, there are $N_{2\varepsilon+1}, f_{3-n^*,2\varepsilon+1}$ such that $N^{temp}_{2\varepsilon+1} \preceq N_{2\varepsilon+1}$ and $f_{3-n^*,2\varepsilon+1} : N^{\oplus}_{3-n^*,\varepsilon} \to N_{2\varepsilon+1}$ is an embedding that includes $f_{3-n^*,2\varepsilon}$. Now we define $f_{n^*,2\varepsilon+1} : N^{\oplus}_{n^*,\varepsilon} \to N_{2\varepsilon+1}$ by $f_{n^*,2\varepsilon+1}(x) = f^{temp}_{n^*,2\varepsilon+1}(x)$. By Claim 7.15 $(**)_{n^*}$ holds, so requirement 8 is satisfied. As for $m = 1,2$ the embedding $f_{m,2\varepsilon+1}$ includes $f_{m,2\varepsilon}$, requirement 7 is satisfied. Without loss of generality requirement 1 is satisfied. Requirement 4 is not relevant in this case. Requirements 5,6 are satisfied.

The construction of $N_{2\varepsilon+2}, f_{n,2\varepsilon+2}$*:* By Proposition 7.7, there are $N_{2\varepsilon+2}$, $f_{1,2\varepsilon+2}, f_{2,2\varepsilon+2}$ such that: $NF(f_{n,2\varepsilon+1}[N^{\oplus}_{n,\varepsilon}], f_{n,2\varepsilon+2}[N_{n,\varepsilon+1}], N_{2\varepsilon+1}, N_{2\varepsilon+2})$, and the reduction of $f_{n,2\varepsilon+1}$ to $N_{0,\varepsilon}$ is the identity [Let $f^{+}_{n,2\varepsilon+1}$ be an injection of $N_{n,\varepsilon+1}$, $f_{n,2\varepsilon+1} \subseteq f^{+}_{n,2\varepsilon+1}$, and the reduction of $f^{+}_{n,2\varepsilon+1}$ to $N_{0,\varepsilon+1}$ is the identity. Substitute the models $N_{0,\varepsilon}, N_{0,\varepsilon+1}, f_{n,2\varepsilon+1}[N^{\oplus}_{n,\varepsilon}], N_{2\varepsilon+1}, f^{+}_{2\varepsilon+1}[N_{n,\varepsilon+1}], N_{2\varepsilon+2}$ which appear here, instead of the models $M_{0,0}, M_{0,1}, M_{n,0}, N_0, M_{n,1}, N_1$ which appear in Proposition 7.7 respectively. Assumption a of Proposition 7.7 (i.e. $NF(N_{0,\varepsilon}, N_{0,\varepsilon+1}, f_{n,2\varepsilon+1}[N^{\oplus}_{n,\varepsilon}], f^{+}_{n,2\varepsilon+1}[N_{n,\varepsilon+1}]))$, is satisfied by Definition 7.4.a (remember that $f^{+}_{n,2\varepsilon+1}$ is an isomorphism over $N_{0,\varepsilon+1}$ and NF respects isomorphisms). Assumption b of Proposition 7.7 is satisfied by requirement 6 of the induction hypothesis. Assumption c of Proposition 7.7 is satisfied by requirement 4 of the induction hypothesis]. Hence we can carry out the construction.

Why is it sufficient? By clause 7 for $n = 1,2$ $f_{n,\lambda^+} : M_n \to N_{\lambda^+}$ is an embedding over M_0.

Claim 7.16. $f_{1,\lambda^+}[M_1] = f_{2,\lambda^+}[M_2] = N_{\lambda^+}$.

Proof. Toward a contradiction suppose there is $n \in \{1,2\}$ such that $f_{n,\lambda^+}[M_n] \neq N_{\lambda^+}$. By Density (Theorem 2.26.1), there is an element b such that $tp(b, f_{n,\lambda^+}[M_n], N_{\lambda^+})$ is basic. $\langle f_{n,2\varepsilon}[N_{n,\varepsilon}] : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$ is a representation of $f_{n,\lambda^+}[M_n]$, so by Definition 2.18 there is $\varepsilon < \lambda^+$ such that for every $\zeta \in (\varepsilon, \lambda^+)$ the type $q_\zeta := tp(b, f_{n,2\zeta}[N_{n,\zeta}], N_{\lambda^+})$ does not fork over $f_{n,2\varepsilon}[N_{n,\varepsilon}]$. We choose this ε such that $b \in N_{2\varepsilon}$, (remember: $b \in N_{\lambda^+} = \bigcup\{N_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\}$). So q_ζ is basic. Define $p_\zeta := f^{-1}_{n,2\zeta}(q_\zeta)$. So $p_\varepsilon \in S^{bs}(N_{n,\varepsilon})$. For every $\zeta \in (\varepsilon, \lambda^+)$, q_ζ is the non-forking extension of q_ε, so p_ζ is the non-forking extension of p_ε. Hence by Definition 7.4, there is an end segment $S^* \subseteq \lambda^+$ such that for $\zeta \in S^*$, p_ζ is realized in $N^{\oplus}_{2\zeta}$. But $q_\zeta = tp(b, f_{n,2\zeta}[N_{n,\zeta}], N_{2\zeta})$. So for every $\zeta \in S^*$ we have $(*)_{n,\zeta}$ (p_ζ is a witness for this). So by clause 8 there are $m \in \{1,2\}$ and a stationary set $S^{**} \subseteq S^*$ such that for every $\zeta \in S^{**}$ we have $(**)_{m,\zeta}$, (there are no two non-stationary subsets which their union is an end segment of λ^+). The sequences $\langle N_{2\zeta} : \zeta \in S^{**}\rangle$, $\langle N_{m,\zeta} : \zeta \in S^{**}\rangle$, $\langle f_{m,2\zeta} : \zeta \in S^{**}\rangle$ are increasing and continuous. But by $(**)_{m,\zeta}$, we have $f_{m,2\zeta+1}[N^{\oplus}_{m,\zeta+1}]\bigcap N_{2\zeta}\neq f_{m,2\zeta}[N_{m,\zeta}]$, in contradiction to Proposition 1.31. $\dashv$

By Claim 7.16 $f^{-1}_{2,\lambda^+}\circ f_{1,\lambda^+}$ is an embedding of M_1 onto M_2 over M_0. In the proof of item b we have to note that $f^{-1}_{2,\lambda^+}\circ f_{1,\lambda^+}(a_1)=f^{-1}_{2,0}\circ f_{1,0}(a_1)=a_2$ (by clause 3). In the proof of item c we have to note that $f^{-1}_{2,\lambda^+}\circ f_{1,\lambda^+}\restriction N^*=f^{-1}_{2,0}\circ f_{1,0}\restriction N^*$ and by clause 3 it is the identity. $\dashv$

Corollary 7.17.

(a) $(K_{\lambda^+}, \preceq^{NF} \restriction K_{\lambda^+})$ *has amalgamation. So* $(K^{sat}, \preceq^{NF} \restriction K^{sat})$ *has amalgamation.*

(b) Locality: Let M_0, M_1, M_2 *be models in* K_{λ^+}*, such that* $M_0 \preceq M_1$*,* $M_0 \preceq M_2$*. Suppose there is* $N_0 \in K_\lambda$ *such that:* $N_0 \prec M_0$ *and for every* $N \in K_\lambda$*,* $[N_0 \preceq N \preceq M_0] \Rightarrow tp(a_1, N, M_1) = tp(a_2, N, M_2)$*. Then* $tp(a_1, M_0, M_1) = tp(a_2, M_0, M_2)$*. [The version we actually use: Suppose there is* $N_0 \in K_\lambda$ *such that* $tp(a_n, M_0, M_2)$ *does not fork over* N_0 *and* $tp(a_1, N_0, M_1) = tp(a_2, N_0, M_2)$*. Then* $tp(a_1, M_0, M_1) = tp(a_2, M_0, M_2)$*].*

Proof.

(a) Suppose for $n = 1, 2$ $M_0 \prec^{NF} M_n$. By Proposition 7.12.a, there is M_n^+ such that $M_n \prec^+ M_n^+$. By Proposition 7.12.a $M_0 \prec^+ M_n^+$. So by Theorem 7.13.c (the uniqueness of the $\prec^+$-extension), there is an isomorphism $f : M_1^+ \to M_2^+$ over M_0. Hence $(f \restriction M_1, id_{M_2}, M_2^+)$ is an amalgamation of M_1, M_2 over M_0. Now Proposition 7.10.a.

(b) Locality: By Proposition 7.12.a there is M_n^+ such that $M_n \prec^+ M_n^+$. By Theorem 7.13.b there is an isomorphism $f : M_1^+ \to M_2^+$ over M_0, such that $f(a_1) = a_2$. So $(f \restriction M_1, id_{M_2}, M_2^+)$ witnesses that $tp(a_1, M_0, M_1) = tp(a_2, M_0, M_2)$.

$\dashv$

Theorem 7.18. *(a)* $(K^{sat}, \preceq^{NF} \restriction K^{sat})$ *satisfies axiom c in* λ^+ *(1.1.2.c).*
(b) If $(K^{sat}, \preceq^{NF} \restriction K^{sat})$ *satisfies smoothness, then it is an a.e.c. in* λ^+*.*
(c) $(K^{sat}, \preceq^{NF} \restriction K^{sat})$ *has the amalgamation property.*

Proof. (a) Let $j < \lambda^{+2}$ and $\langle M_i : i < j \rangle$ be an $\preceq^{NF}$-increasing continuous of models in K^{sat}. Let M_j be the union of this sequence. We prove that $M_j \in K^{sat}$ by induction on j. Let N be a model in K_λ such that $N \prec M_j$.

Case a: $\lambda < cf(j)$. In this case for some $i < j$ $N \prec M_i$. Since M_i is full over N, of course M_j is. Therefore $M_j \in K^{sat}$.

Case b: $cf(j) \leq \lambda$. Without loss of generality $cf(j) = j$. So $|j| = j = cf(j) \leq \lambda$. Let $\langle N_{i,\alpha} : \alpha \in \lambda^+ \rangle$ be a representation of M_i. For every $i < j$ let E_i be a club of λ^+ such that for $\alpha \in E_i$, $NF(N_{i,\alpha}, N_{i+1,\alpha}, N_{i,\alpha+1}, N_{i+1,\alpha+1})$ and if i is a limit ordinal, then $N_{i,\alpha} = \bigcup\{N_{\varepsilon,\alpha} : \varepsilon < i\}$. So $E := \bigcap\{E_i : i < j\}$ is a club set of λ^+ (because $|j| \leq \lambda$). Define $N_{j,\alpha} := \bigcup\{N_{i,\alpha} : i < j\}$. $\langle N_{j,\alpha} : \alpha \leq \lambda^+ \rangle$ is a representation of M_j. Take $\alpha^* \in E$ such that $N \subseteq N_{j,\alpha^*}$. By axiom 1.1.1.e $N \preceq N_{j,\alpha^*}$, so it is sufficient to prove that M_j is saturated over N_{j,α^*}. Let $q \in S^{bs}(N_{j,\alpha^*})$. We will prove that q is realized in M_j. By the definition of E the sequence $\langle N_{i,\alpha^*} : i < j \rangle$ is increasing and continuous, so by Definition 2.1.3.c (the local character) there is an ordinal $i < j$ such that q does not fork over N_{i,α^*}. M_i is saturated in λ^+ over λ, so there is $a \in M_i$ such that $tp(a, N_{i,\alpha^*}, M_i) = q \restriction N_{i,\alpha^*}$. By Definition 6.2 we have $\widehat{NF}(N_{i,\alpha^*}, N_{j,\alpha^*}, M_i, M_j)$, so by Theorem 6.3.e ($\widehat{NF}$ respects $\mathfrak{s}$) $tp(a, N_{j,\alpha^*}, M_j)$ does not fork over N_{i,α^*}. Hence by Definition 2.1.3.d (the uniqueness of the non-forking extension) $tp(a, N_{j,\alpha^*}, M_j) = q$.

(b) The first part of Axiom c of a.e.c. in λ^+ is item a here. Axioms b,e and the second part of axiom c follows by Proposition 6.5.f.

(c) By Corollary 7.17.a. $\dashv$

8. RELATIVE SATURATION

Discussion: This section is, like its previous, a preparation for the proof of Theorem 7.3. We study the relation $\preceq^{\otimes}$, a kind of relative saturation. This relation is similar to 'closure of $\preceq^{NF}$ under smoothness' (see Proposition 8.3.b). Theorem 9.13 says that non-equality between the relations $\preceq^{NF}, \preceq^{\otimes}$ is equivalent to non-smoothness and also to a strengthened version of non-smoothness.

Hypothesis 8.1. $\mathfrak{s}$ is a weakly successful semi-good λ-frame with conjugation.

Definition 8.2. $\preceq^{\otimes} := \{(M_0, M_1) : M_0, M_1 \in K^{sat}$, $M_0 \prec M_1$ and for every $N_0, N_1 \in K_\lambda$, if $M_0 \succeq N_0 \preceq N_1 \preceq M_1$ and $p \in S^{bs}(N_1)$ does not fork over N_0, then for some element $d \in M_0$ $tp(d, N_1, M_1) = p\}$.

Proposition 8.3.

(a) If $M_0 \in K^{sat}$ and $M_0 \preceq^{NF} M_1$ then $M_0 \preceq^{\otimes} M_1$.

(b) If $\langle M_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \leq \delta \rangle$ is an $\preceq^{NF}$-increasing continuous sequence of models in K^{sat} and for every $\varepsilon \in \delta$, $M_\varepsilon \preceq^{NF} M_{\delta+1}$, then $M_\delta \preceq^{\otimes} M_{\delta+1}$.

Proof. (a) Suppose $M_0 \preceq^{NF} M_1$ and $M_0 \in K^{sat}$. Let N_0, N_1 be models K_λ with $M_0 \succeq N_0 \preceq N_1 \preceq M_1$ and let p be a type $S^{bs}(N_1)$ that does not fork over N_0. We have to find an element $d \in M_0$ with $tp(d, N_1, M_1) = p$. By Proposition 6.5.g (LST for $\preceq^{NF}$) for some $N_0^+, N_1^+ \in K_\lambda$ $N_0 \preceq N_0^+$, $N_1 \preceq N_1^+$ and $\widehat{NF}(N_0^+, N_1^+, M_0, M_1)$. By axiom 1.1.1.e $N_0 \preceq N_0^+$ and $N_1 \preceq N_1^+$. Let q be the non-forking extension of p to N_1^+. Since $M_0 \in K^{sat}$ for some $d \in M_0$ $tp(d, N_0^+, M_0) = q \restriction N_0^+$. By Proposition 2.15 q does not fork over N_0, so by Definition 2.1.3.b (monotonicity) q does not fork over N_0^+. By Theorem 6.3 $\widehat{NF}$ respects $\mathfrak{s}$, so $tp(d, N_1^+, M_1)$ does not fork over N_1^+. So by Definition 2.1.3.b (uniqueness) $tp(d, N_1^+, M_1) = q$. Therefore $tp(d, N_1, M_1) = p$.

(b) Suppose $N_0, N_1 \in K_\lambda$, $M_\delta \succeq N_0 \preceq N_1 \preceq M_{\delta+1}$ and $p \in S^{bs}(N_1)$ does not fork over N_0. We have to find an element $d \in M_\delta$ that realizes p. For every $\alpha \leq \delta + 1$ there is a representation $\langle N_{\alpha,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+ \rangle$ of M_α. without loss of generality $cf(\delta) = \delta$.

Case a: $\delta = \lambda^+$. So for some $\alpha < \delta$, $N_0 \subseteq M_\alpha$ and we can use item a.

Case b: $\delta < \lambda^+$. For each $\alpha \in \delta$, let E_α be a club of λ^+ such that for each $\varepsilon \in E_\alpha$: $NF(N_{\alpha,\varepsilon}, N_{\alpha+1,\varepsilon}, N_{\alpha,\varepsilon+1}, N_{\alpha+1,\varepsilon+1})$ and if α is limit then $N_{\alpha,\varepsilon} = \bigcup\{N_{\beta,\varepsilon} : \beta < \alpha\}$. Let $E_\delta := \{\alpha \in \lambda^+ : N_{\delta,\varepsilon} \subseteq N_{\delta+1,\varepsilon},\ N_{\delta,\varepsilon} = \bigcup\{N_{\alpha,\varepsilon} : \alpha < \delta\}\}$. Denote $E := \bigcap\{E_\alpha : \alpha \leq \delta\}$. By cardinality considerations there is

$\varepsilon \in E$ such that for $n < 2$ $N_n \subseteq N_{\delta+n,\varepsilon}$, so by axiom 1.1.1.e $N_n \preceq N_{\delta+n,\varepsilon}$.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
d \in M_\alpha \arrow[r, "id"] & M_\delta \arrow[r, "id"] & M_{\delta+1} & \\
N_{\alpha,\varepsilon} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & N_{\delta,\varepsilon} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & N_{\delta+1,\varepsilon} \arrow[u, "id"] & q \\
& N_0 \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & N_1 \arrow[u, "id"] & p
\end{tikzcd}$$

Let $q \in S^{bs}(N_{\delta+1,\varepsilon})$ be the non-forking extension of p. By Proposition 2.15 (the transitivity proposition), q does not fork over N_0. By Definition 2.1.3.b (monotonicity) q does not fork over $N_{\delta,\varepsilon}$, so $q \restriction N_{\delta,\varepsilon}$ is basic. As $\varepsilon \in E$, the sequence $\langle N_{\alpha,\varepsilon} : \alpha \leq \delta \rangle$ is increasing and continuous. So by Definition 2.1.3.c (local character) there is $\alpha < \delta$ such that $q \restriction N_{\delta,\varepsilon}$ does not fork over $N_{\alpha,\varepsilon}$. So by Proposition 2.15 q does not fork over $N_{\alpha,\varepsilon}$. Since $M_\alpha \preceq^{NF} M_{\delta+1}$ by item a for some $d \in M_\alpha$ $tp(d, N_{\delta+1,\varepsilon}, M_{\delta+1}) = q$. So $tp(d, N_1, M_{\delta+1}) = p$. $\dashv$

The following proposition is similar to the saturativity = model homogeneity lemma.

Proposition 8.4. *Suppose*

(1) $M_0 \preceq^{\otimes} M_1$.
(2) For $n < 3$ $N_n \in K_\lambda$.
(3) $N_0 \preceq M_0$.
(4) $N_2 \succeq N_0 \preceq N_1 \preceq M_1$.

Then for some $N_1^* \in K_\lambda$ *and an embedding* $f : N_2 \to M_0$ *the following hold:*

(a) $f \restriction N_0 = id_{N_0}$.
(b) $NF(N_0, f[N_2], N_1, N_1^*)$.
(c) $N_1^* \preceq M_1$.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
M_0 \arrow[r, "id"] & M_1 \\
f[N_2] \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & N_1^* \arrow[u, "id"] \\
N_0 \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & N_1 \arrow[u, "id"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

Proof. We try to choose $N_{0,\varepsilon}, N_{1,\varepsilon}, N_{2,\varepsilon}, f_\varepsilon$ by induction on $\varepsilon < \lambda^+$ such that:

(1) For $n < 3$ $\langle N_{n,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda^+ \rangle$ is an increasing continuous of models in K_λ.
(2) For $n < 3$ $N_{n,0} = N_n$, $f_0 = id_{N_0}$.
(3) For $\varepsilon < \lambda^+$, $N_{0,\varepsilon} \preceq M_0 \wedge N_{1,\varepsilon} \preceq M_1$.

(4) $\langle f_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \lambda^+ \rangle$ is increasing and continuous.
(5) $f_\varepsilon : N_{0,\varepsilon} \to N_{2,\varepsilon}$ is an embedding over N_0.
(6) For every $\varepsilon \in \lambda^+$ there is a_ε such that $(N_{0,\varepsilon}, N_{0,\varepsilon+1}, a_\varepsilon)$ is a uniqueness triple, $f_{\varepsilon+1}(a_\varepsilon) \in N_{2,\varepsilon}$ and $tp(a_\varepsilon, N_{1,\varepsilon}, N_{1,\varepsilon+1})$ does not fork over $N_{0,\varepsilon}$.
(7) $N_{0,\varepsilon} \preceq N_{1,\varepsilon}$ (actually follows by 6).

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & M_0 \arrow[r, "id"] & M_1 \\
N_{2,\varepsilon+1} & N_{0,\varepsilon+1} \arrow[l, "f_{\varepsilon+1}"'] \arrow[r, "id"] \arrow[u, "id"] & N_{1,\varepsilon+1} \arrow[u, "id"] \\
N_{2,\varepsilon} \arrow[u, "id"] & N_{0,\varepsilon} \arrow[l, "f_\varepsilon"'] \arrow[r, "id"] \arrow[u, "id"] & N_{1,\varepsilon} \arrow[u, "id"] \\
 & N_0 \arrow[r, "id"] \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[ul, "id"] & N_1 \arrow[u, "id"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

By clauses 1,4,5 and particularly 6 and Proposition 1.31 we cannot succeed. Where will we get stuck? For $\varepsilon = 0$ or limit we will not get stuck. Suppose we have defined $N_{0,\varepsilon}, N_{1,\varepsilon}, N_{2,\varepsilon}, f_\varepsilon$. By clause 5, $f_\varepsilon[N_{0,\varepsilon}] \preceq N_{2,\varepsilon}$.

Case a: $f_\varepsilon[N_{0,\varepsilon}] \neq N_{2,\varepsilon}$. In this case we can find $N_{0,\varepsilon+1}, N_{1,\varepsilon+1}, N_{2,\varepsilon+1}, f_{\varepsilon+1}$ such that clauses 1-7 above hold [By the existence of the basic types, there is $b \in N_{2,\varepsilon} - f_\varepsilon[N_{0,\varepsilon}]$ such that $p := tp(b, f_\varepsilon[N_{0,\varepsilon}], N_{2,\varepsilon})$ is basic. Let $q \in S^{bs}(N_{1,\varepsilon})$ be the non-forking extension of $f_\varepsilon^{-1}(p)$. As $M_0 \preceq^{\otimes} M_1 \wedge (n < 2 \Rightarrow N_{n,\varepsilon} \preceq M_n^*) \wedge N_{0,\varepsilon} \preceq N_{1,\varepsilon} \in K_\lambda$, there is $a \in M_0$ which realizes q. So $tp(a, N_{0,\varepsilon}, M_0) = f_\varepsilon^{-1}(p)$. As $\mathfrak{s}$ is weakly successful, we can find $N_{0,\varepsilon+1}$ such that $(N_{0,\varepsilon}, N_{0,\varepsilon+1}, a) \in K^{3,uq}$. As M_0 is saturated in λ^+ over λ, by Lemma 1.32 (the saturation = model homogeneity lemma), without loss of generality $N_{0,\varepsilon+1} \preceq M_0$. Denote a as a_ε. Choose $N_{1,\varepsilon+1} \preceq M_1$ such that $N_{0,\varepsilon+1} \bigcup N_{1,\varepsilon} \subseteq N_{1,\varepsilon+1}$. By axiom 1.1.1.e $N_{0,\varepsilon+1} \preceq N_{1,\varepsilon+1} \wedge N_{1,\varepsilon} \preceq N_{1,\varepsilon+1}$. Now $f_\varepsilon(tp(a_\varepsilon, N_{0,\varepsilon}, N_{0,\varepsilon+1}) = p$. So there are $N_{2,\varepsilon+1}, f_{\varepsilon+1}$ such that: $N_{2,\varepsilon} \preceq N_{2,\varepsilon+1}$, $f_{\varepsilon+1}(a_\varepsilon) = b$, $f_\varepsilon \subseteq f_{\varepsilon+1} : N_{0,\varepsilon+1} \to N_{2,\varepsilon+1}$].

Case b: $f_\varepsilon[N_{0,\varepsilon}] = N_{2,\varepsilon}$. Hence $N_{1,\varepsilon}, f_\varepsilon^{-1} \restriction N_2$ witness that our proposition is true [By 6, Definition 5.7 and Definition 5.6, $\zeta < \varepsilon \Rightarrow NF(N_{0,\zeta}, N_{0,\zeta+1}, N_{1,\zeta}, N_{1,\zeta+1})$. So by Theorem 5.25 (the long transitivity theorem), $NF(N_0, N_{0,\varepsilon}, N_1, N_{1,\varepsilon})$. So by the monotonicity of NF, we have $NF(N_0, f_\varepsilon^{-1}[N_2], N_1, N_{1,\varepsilon})$. So clause b in the proposition is satisfied. Clauses a,c are satisfied by 5,3 respectively].

Let $\varepsilon + 1$ be the first ordinal we will get stuck on . In other words, suppose we have defined $N_{0,\varepsilon}, N_{1,\varepsilon}, N_{2,\varepsilon}, f_\varepsilon$ and we cannot find $N_{0,\varepsilon+1}, N_{1,\varepsilon+1}, N_{2,\varepsilon+1}, f_{\varepsilon+1}$ such that clauses 1-7 above hold. so case b holds and the proposition is proved. $\dashv$

Proposition 8.5. *If* $M_0 \preceq M_1$, $n < 2 \Rightarrow (||M_n||) = \lambda^+ \wedge A_n \subseteq M_n \wedge |A_n| \leq \lambda)$*, then there are models* $N_0, N_1 \in K_\lambda$ *such that:* $n < 2 \Rightarrow A_n \subseteq N_n \preceq M_n$ *and* $N_1 \bigcap M_0 = N_0$ *(so of course* $N_0 \preceq N_1$*).*

Proof. For $n < 2$ we will construct by induction on $m < \omega$ a model $N_{n,m}$ such that $\langle N_{n,m} : m \leq \omega \rangle$ is $\preceq$-increasing and continuous of models in K_λ, $A_n \subseteq N_{n,0}$, $N_{0,m} \subseteq N_{1,m}$, $N_{1,m} \bigcap M_0 \subseteq N_{0,m+1}$, $N_{n,m} \preceq M_n$. This construction is possible as $LST(K, \preceq) \leq \lambda$. Now $M_0 \bigcap N_{1,\omega} = N_{0,\omega}$ [Why? If $x \in M_0 \bigcap N_{1,\omega}$, then for some $m < \omega$ we have $x \in N_{1,m} \bigcap M_0 \subseteq N_{0,m+1} \subseteq N_{0,\omega}$ and from the other side, if $x \in N_{0,\omega}$ then for some $m < \omega$ we have $x \in N_{0,m} \subseteq N_{1,m}$, so $x \in M_0 \bigcap N_{1,\omega}$]. $\dashv$

Proposition 8.6. *If* $M_1^* \preceq^{\otimes} M_2^*$ *then there is an increasing continuous sequence of models in* K^{sat}, $\langle M_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \leq \lambda^+ + 1 \rangle$ *such that:*

(a) $M_{\lambda^+} = M_1^*$, $M_{\lambda^+ + 1} = M_2^*$.
(b) $\varepsilon < \lambda^+ \Rightarrow M_\varepsilon \prec^+ M_{\varepsilon+1}$.
(c) $\varepsilon < \lambda^+ \Rightarrow M_\varepsilon \preceq^{NF} M_2^*$.

Proof. By Proposition 7.12.c, there is a winning strategy for player 2 in the $\prec^+$-game. Let F be such a winning strategy. Enumerate M_2^* by $\{a_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\}$. We construct $\langle N_{\alpha,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon \leq \alpha \rangle$, N_α by induction on α such that the following hold:

1. For each $\varepsilon \leq \alpha$, $N_{\alpha,\varepsilon} \in K_\lambda$ and $N_{\alpha,\varepsilon} \preceq M_1^*$.
2. $\langle N_{\alpha,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon \leq \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ is increasing continuous in the variables α, ε.
3. $\langle N_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ is an increasing continuous of models in K_λ.
4. $N_{\alpha,\alpha} \preceq N_\alpha \preceq M_2^*$.
5. If $\alpha + 1$ is odd then for each $\varepsilon \leq \alpha$, $N_{\alpha+1,\varepsilon+1}$ is isomorphic to $F(\langle N_{\beta,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon + 1 \leq \beta \leq \alpha + 1 \rangle, \langle N_{\beta,\varepsilon+1} : \varepsilon + 1 \leq \beta \leq \alpha \rangle)$ over $N_{\alpha,\varepsilon+1} \bigcup N_{\alpha+1,\varepsilon}$.
6. If $\alpha + 1$ is odd then $NF(N_{\alpha,\alpha}, N_\alpha, N_{\alpha+1,\alpha+1}, N_{\alpha+1})$
7. $a_\alpha \in N_{2\alpha+2}$.
8. $N_{2\alpha} \bigcap M_1^* \subseteq N_{2\alpha,2\alpha}$.
9. If $\alpha + 1$ is odd then $N_{\alpha+1,\alpha+1} = N_{\alpha+1,\alpha}$.
10. If $\alpha + 1$ is odd then $N_{\alpha+1,0} \bigcap N_\alpha = N_{\alpha,0}$, $N_{\alpha+1,0} \neq N_{\alpha,0}$.
11. If $\alpha + 1$ is even then for each $\varepsilon \leq \alpha$ $N_{\alpha+1,\varepsilon} = N_{\alpha,\varepsilon}$.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
M_\varepsilon \arrow[r, "id"] & M_{\varepsilon+1} \arrow[r, "id"] & M_\alpha \arrow[r, "id"] & M_{\lambda^+} = M_1^* \arrow[r, "id"] & M_{\lambda^+ +1} = M_2^* \\
N_{\alpha,\varepsilon} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & N_{\alpha,\varepsilon+1} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & N_{\alpha,\alpha} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[rr, "id"] & & N_\alpha \arrow[u, "id"'] \\
N_{\varepsilon+1,\varepsilon} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[r, "id"] & N_{\varepsilon+1,\varepsilon+1} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[rrr, "id"] & & & N_{\varepsilon+1} \arrow[u, "id"'] \\
N_{\varepsilon,\varepsilon} \arrow[u, "id"] \arrow[rrrr, "id"] & & & & N_\varepsilon \arrow[u, "id"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

[Explanation: $N_{\alpha,\alpha}$, N_α are approximations for M_1^*, M_2^* respectively. $N_{\alpha,\varepsilon}$ is an approximation for M_ε. When $\alpha+1$ is even, we increase the approximations of M_1^*, M_2^* such that in the end we will have $M_2^* \subseteq \bigcup\{N_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+\}$, $M_1^* = \bigcup\{N_{\alpha,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+\}$ by 7,8 respectively. when $\alpha+1$ is odd, we increase the approximations of M_ε (mainly by clause 10). Clause 11 says that in even step the approximations to M_ε do not increase. Clause 5 insure that in the end we will have $M_\varepsilon \prec^+ M_{\varepsilon+1}$. Clause 6 insure that in the end requirement c will be satisfied. The point of the proof is, that we could not demand 6 for every α, (as otherwise we prove $M_1^* \preceq^{NF} M_2^*$, which might be wrong). But we succeed to prove that $NF(N_{\alpha,\varepsilon}, N_\alpha, N_{\alpha+1,\varepsilon}, N_{\alpha+1})$ so $M_\varepsilon \preceq^{NF} M_2^*$].

Why can we carry out the construction? We construct by induction on α. For limit α, by clauses 2,3 there is no freedom. Clauses 1,4 are satisfied by the smoothness, clauses 5,6,7,9,10,11 are not relevant and clause 8 is satisfied. For $\alpha = 0$ we choose $N_0, N_{0,0}$ by Proposition 8.5. Suppose we have defined $\langle N_{\alpha,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon \leq \alpha \rangle$, N_α. what will we do in step $\alpha+1$?
Case a: $\alpha+1$ is even. For $\varepsilon \leq \alpha$ define $N_{\alpha+1,\varepsilon} := N_{\alpha,\varepsilon}$. By Proposition 8.5 there are $N_{\alpha+1}$, $N_{\alpha+1,\alpha+1}$ as required, especially clauses 7,8 are satisfied.
Case b: $\alpha+1$ is odd. Define $N^{temp}_{\alpha+1,\varepsilon}$ by induction on $\varepsilon \leq \alpha$ such that:

(1) $\langle N^{temp}_{\alpha+1,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon \leq \alpha \rangle$ is an $\preceq$-increasing continuous sequence.
(2) $N^{temp}_{\alpha+1,\varepsilon+1} = F(\langle N_{\beta,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon+1 \leq \beta \leq \alpha \rangle^\frown \langle N^{temp}_{\alpha+1,\varepsilon} \rangle,\ \langle N_{\beta,\varepsilon+1} : \varepsilon+1 \leq \beta < \alpha \rangle)$.
(3) $N_{\alpha,0} \preceq N^{temp}_{\alpha+1,0}$.

Now by Proposition 8.4, there are $N_{\alpha+1}$ and an embedding $g : N^{temp}_{\alpha+1,\alpha} \to M_1^*$ over $N_{\alpha,\alpha}$ such that we have $NF(N_{\alpha,\alpha}, N_\alpha, g[N^{temp}_{\alpha+1,\alpha}], N_{\alpha+1})$. For every $\varepsilon \leq \alpha$ define $N_{\alpha+1,\varepsilon} := g[N^{temp}_{\alpha+1,\varepsilon}]$. Now define $N_{\alpha+1,\alpha+1} := N_{\alpha+1,\alpha}$. So we can carry out the construction.

Why is it sufficient? For $\varepsilon < \lambda^+$ define $M_\varepsilon := \bigcup\{N_{\alpha,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon \leq \alpha < \lambda^+\}$. Define $M_{\lambda^+} := \bigcup\{M_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\}$, $M_{\lambda^+ +1} := \bigcup\{N_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+\}$. We will prove that the sequence $\langle M_\varepsilon : 0 < \varepsilon < \lambda^+ + 1\rangle$ satisfies requirements a,b,c:
(a) By 3,4,7 $M_{\lambda^+ +1} = M^*_2$. Why is $M_{\lambda^+} = M^*_1$? By 1 $M_{\lambda^+} \subseteq M^*_1$. Let $x \in M^*_1$. Then $x \in M^*_2 = M_{\lambda^+ +1}$. So by the definition of $M_{\lambda^+ +1}$ and 3, there is α such that $x \in N_{2\alpha}$. So by 8 $x \in N_{2\alpha,2\alpha}$. But by the definitions of $M_\varepsilon, M_{\lambda^+}$, $N_{2\alpha,2\alpha} \subseteq M_{2\alpha} \subseteq M_{\lambda^+}$.
(b) By 2,10 $|M_0| = \lambda^+$. By 2 and the smoothness, the sequence $\langle M_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \lambda^+\rangle$ is $\preceq$-increasing and continuous. So $|M_\varepsilon| = \lambda^+$. Does $\varepsilon < \lambda^+ \Rightarrow M_\varepsilon \in K^{sat}$? Not exactly, but we can prove by induction on ε that $0 < \varepsilon < \lambda^+ \Rightarrow (M_\varepsilon \in K^{sat} \wedge M_\varepsilon \prec^+ M_{\varepsilon+1})$: For $\varepsilon = 0$ by 10. For limit ε by Theorem 7.18.a. For ε successor by 5 and Proposition 7.10.b. So requirement b is satisfied.
(c) The sequences $\langle N_{\alpha,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon \leq \alpha < \lambda^+\rangle$, $\langle N_\alpha : \varepsilon \leq \alpha < \lambda^+\rangle$ are representations of M_ε, $M_{\lambda^+ +1}$ respectively. Let $\alpha \in \lambda^+$. We will prove $NF(N_{\alpha,\varepsilon}, N_\alpha, N_{\alpha+1,\varepsilon}, N_{\alpha+1})$. If $\alpha + 1$ is even, this is satisfied by clause 11. So let $\alpha + 1$ be odd. By 6 we have: (*) $NF(N_{\alpha,\alpha}, N_\alpha, N_{\alpha+1,\alpha+1}, N_{\alpha+1})$. By 5 and Theorem 5.25 (the transitivity of NF), $NF(N_{\alpha,\varepsilon}, N_{\alpha,\alpha}, N_{\alpha+1,\varepsilon}, N_{\alpha+1,\alpha})$ [Why? By 5 (and Proposition 7.12.c), $\forall\zeta \in [\varepsilon,\alpha) NF(N_{\alpha,\zeta}, N_{\alpha,\zeta+1}, N_{\alpha+1,\zeta}, N_{\alpha+1,\zeta+1})$. The sequences $\langle N_{\alpha,\zeta} : \zeta \in [\varepsilon,\alpha)\rangle$, $\langle N_{\alpha+1,\zeta} : \zeta \in [\varepsilon,\alpha)\rangle$ are increasing and continuous. So by Theorem 5.25 (the long transitivity theorem), $NF(N_{\alpha,\varepsilon}, N_{\alpha,\alpha}, N_{\alpha+1,\varepsilon}, N_{\alpha+1,\alpha})$. So by the monotonicity of NF, we have: (**) $NF(N_{\alpha,\varepsilon}, N_{\alpha,\alpha}, N_{\alpha+1,\varepsilon}, N_{\alpha+1,\alpha+1})$]. Now by (*),(**) and Theorem 5.25 $NF(N_{\alpha,\varepsilon}, N_{\alpha+1,\varepsilon}, N_\alpha, N_{\alpha+1})$. Note that we use here freely Theorem 5.22 (the symmetry theorem of NF). $\dashv$

9. Non-smoothness implies non-structure

Hypothesis 9.1. $\mathfrak{s}$ is a weakly successful semi-good λ-frame with conjugation.

Definition 9.2. Let $\bar{M} = \langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^*\rangle$ be an increasing sequence of models in K_{λ^+}. We say that $\bar{M}$ is *$\preceq^{NF}$-increasing in the successor ordinals* if $\beta < \gamma < \alpha^* \Rightarrow M_{\beta+1} \preceq^{NF} M_{\gamma+1}$.

Definition 9.3. Let $\alpha \leq \lambda^{+2}$ and let $\bar{M} = \langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^{+2}\rangle$ be an $\preceq^{NF}$-increasing in the successor ordinals and continuous sequence with union M. Define $S(\bar{M}) =: \{\delta \in \lambda^{+2} : \exists\alpha \in (\delta, \lambda^{+2})\ M_\delta \not\preceq^{NF} M_\alpha\}$. Define $S(M) =: S(\bar{M})/D_{\lambda^{+2}}$ where $D_{\lambda^{+2}}$ is the clubs filter on λ^{+2}. (By Proposition 9.5 $S(M)$ does not depend on the representation $\bar{M}$).

Proposition 9.4. *Let $\bar{M} = \langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^{+2}\rangle$ be a $\preceq^{NF}$-increasing in the successor ordinals and continuous sequence. Then:*
(a) For each α, β with $\alpha < \beta < \lambda^{+2}$, $M_\alpha \preceq^{NF} M_{\alpha+1} \Leftrightarrow M_\alpha \preceq^{NF} M_\beta$.
(b) $S(\bar{M}) = \{\delta \in \lambda^{+2} : \forall\alpha \in (\delta, \lambda^{+2})\ M_\delta \not\preceq^{NF} M_\alpha\}$.

Proof.
(a) Easy (by Proposition 6.5.c).

(b) By item a.

$\dashv$

Proposition 9.5. *Suppose:*

1. *The sequences* $\bar{M}^1 := \langle M_{\alpha,1} : \alpha < \lambda^{+2}\rangle$, $\bar{M}^2 := \langle M_{\alpha,1} : \alpha < \lambda^{+2}\rangle$ *are* $\preceq^{NF}$*-increasing in the successor ordinals and continuous.*
2. $M_1 = \bigcup\{M_{\alpha,1} : \alpha < \lambda^{+2}\}$ *and* $M_2 = \bigcup\{M_{\alpha,2} : \alpha < \lambda^{+2}\}$*.*
3. M_1, M_2 *are isomorphic.*

Then $S(\bar{M}^1)/D_{\lambda^{+2}} = S(\bar{M}^2)/D_{\lambda^{+2}}$*.*

Proof. Let $f : M_1 \to M_2$ be an isomorphism. Define $E := \{\alpha \in \lambda^{+2} : f[M_{1,\alpha}] = M_{2,\alpha}\}$. So $S(\langle M_{\alpha,1} : \alpha \in E\rangle) = S(\langle f[M_{\alpha,1}] : \alpha \in E\rangle) = S(\langle M_{\alpha,2} : \alpha \in E\rangle)$. By Proposition 9.4.b $S(\langle M_{\alpha,1} : \alpha \in E\rangle) = S(\bar{M}^1)\bigcap E$ and $S(\langle M_{\alpha,2} : \alpha \in E\rangle) = S(\bar{M}^2)\bigcap E$. Hence $S(\bar{M}^1)\bigcap E = S(\bar{M}^2)\bigcap E$. $\dashv$

Proposition 9.6. *Assume that we can assign to each* $S \in S^{\lambda^{+2}}_{\lambda^+} := \{S : S$ *is a stationary subset of* λ^{+2} *and* $(\forall \alpha \in S) cf(\alpha) = \lambda^+\}$*, a model* $M^S \in K_{\lambda^{+2}}$ *with* $S(M^S) = S/D_{\lambda^{+2}}$ *(especially it is defined).*

Then there are $2^{\lambda^{+2}}$ *non-isomorphic models in* $K_{\lambda^{+2}}$*.*

Proof. Since $|S^{\lambda^{+2}}_{\lambda^+}| = 2^{\lambda^{+2}}$ it follows by Proposition 9.5. $\dashv$

The following theorem says that there is a kind of a witness for non-$\preceq^{NF}$-smoothness, such that if it holds, then there are $2^{\lambda^{+2}}$ non-isomorphic models in $K_{\lambda^{+2}}$.

Theorem 9.7. *Suppose that there is an increasing continuous sequence* $\langle M^*_\alpha : \alpha \leq \lambda^+ + 1\rangle$ *of models in* K^{sat} *such that for each* α, β *with* $\alpha < \beta < \lambda^+$ *we have* $M^*_\alpha \prec^+ M^*_\beta \preceq^{NF} M^*_{\lambda^+ + 1}$ *but* $M^*_{\lambda^+} \not\preceq^{NF} M^*_{\lambda^+ + 1}$*.*

Then there are $2^{\lambda^{+2}}$ *pairwise non-isomorphic models in* $K_{\lambda^{+2}}$*.*

Proof. By Proposition 9.6, it is enough to assign to each $S \in S^{\lambda^{+2}}_{\lambda^+}$ a model $M^S \in K_{\lambda^{+2}}$ with $S(M^S) = S/D_{\lambda^{+2}}$. Let S be a stationary subset of λ^{+2} such that $\alpha \in S \Rightarrow cf(\alpha) = \lambda^+$. We will choose a model M_β by induction on $\beta < \lambda^{+2}$ such that:

1. $M_\beta \in K^{sat}$.
2. The sequence $\langle M_\beta : \beta < \lambda^{+2}\rangle$ is continuous.
3. $\beta \in \lambda^{+2} - S \Rightarrow M_\beta \prec^+ M_{\beta+1}$.
4. If $\beta \in S$ then $(M_\beta, M_{\beta+1}) \cong (M^*_{\lambda^+}, M^*_{\lambda^+ + 1})$.
5. For each $\beta < \lambda^{+2}$ $M_\beta \preceq^{NF} M_{\beta+1} \Leftrightarrow \beta \notin S$.

Note that clause 5 is the crucial point and it actually follows by clauses 3,4.

[Why is it possible to choose M_β? For $\beta = 0$ we choose a model $M_0 \in K^{sat}$. For limit ordinal β, define $M_\beta = \bigcup\{M_\gamma : \gamma < \beta\}$. What will we do in the $\beta + 1$ step? Clause 5 follows by clauses 3,4. So it is enough to find $M_{\beta+1}$ which satisfies clauses 3,4.

case a: $\beta \notin S$. In this case we choose $M_{\beta+1}$ such that $M_\beta \prec^+ M_{\beta+1}$ (see Proposition 7.12.a).

case b: $\beta \in S$. Since $M_\beta, M^*_{\lambda^+}$ are saturated in λ^+ over λ, they are isomorphic. Hence we can find $M_{\beta+1}$ with clause 4]

Define $M^S := \bigcup\{M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^{+2}\}$. It remains to prove that $S(M^S) = S/D_{\lambda^{+2}}$ (especially $S(M^S)$ is defined). But if $S(\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^{+2}\rangle)$ is defined then by clause 5 $S(M^S) = S(\langle M_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^{+2}\rangle)/D_{\lambda^{+2}} = S/D_{\lambda^{+2}}$. So it is enough to prove that it is defined, namely to prove that for each α, β with $\alpha < \beta < \lambda^{+2}$ we have $M_{\alpha+1} \preceq^{NF} M_{\beta+1}$. But it is easier to prove more:

Claim 9.8. *For every $\beta \leq \lambda^+$ $(*)_\beta$: For each α with $\alpha < \beta$ the following hold:*

(1) $M_{\alpha+1} \preceq^{NF} M_{\beta+1}$.

(2) If $\beta \notin S$ then $M_{\alpha+1} \prec^+ M_{\beta+1}$.

Proof. $(*)_0$ is vacuous.

Why does $(*)_\beta \Rightarrow (*)_{\beta+1}$ hold? Fix $\alpha < \beta + 1$. We prove that $M_{\alpha+1} \prec^+ M_{\beta+2}$. By clause 3 $M_{\beta+1} \prec^+ M_{\beta+2}$. So if $\alpha = \beta$ then $M_{\alpha+1} \prec^+ M_{\beta+2}$. So without loss of generality $\alpha < \beta$. By $(*)_\beta$ $M_{\alpha+1} \preceq^{NF} M_{\beta+1}$. But $M_{\beta+1} \prec^+ M_{\beta+2}$. So by Proposition 7.10.c $M_{\alpha+1} \prec^+ M_{\beta+2}$. This establishes $(*)_{\beta+1}$.

Assume that δ is a limit ordinal and $(*)_\beta$ holds for each β with $\beta < \delta$. We have to prove $(*)_\delta$. Let $\langle \gamma(\varepsilon) : \varepsilon < cf(\delta)\rangle$ be an increasing continuous of ordinals with limit δ, such that for every ε, $\gamma(\varepsilon+1)$ is a successor of a successor ordinal. Note that for every $\varepsilon < \mathrm{cf}(\delta)$ $\gamma_\varepsilon \notin S$, because $cf(\gamma_\varepsilon) < \mathrm{cf}(\delta) \leq \lambda^+$. Consider the sequence $\langle M_{\gamma_\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < cf(\delta)\rangle$.

Claim 9.9. *$M_{\gamma_\varepsilon} \prec^+ M_{\gamma_{\varepsilon+1}}$ for each $\varepsilon < cf(\delta)$.*

Proof. Since $\gamma_\varepsilon \notin S$, by clause 3 $M_{\gamma_\varepsilon} \prec^+ M_{\gamma_\varepsilon+1}$. If $\gamma_{\varepsilon+1} = \gamma_\varepsilon + 1$ then the claim is proved. Assume $\gamma_{\varepsilon+1} > \gamma_\varepsilon + 1$. $\gamma_{\varepsilon+1} = \zeta + 1$ for some successor ζ. $\zeta \notin S$. So by $(*)_\zeta.2$, $M_{\gamma_\varepsilon+1} \prec^+ M_{\zeta+1} = M_{\gamma_{\varepsilon+1}}$. So $M_{\gamma_\varepsilon} \prec^+ M_{\gamma_\varepsilon+1} \prec^+ M_{\gamma_{\varepsilon+1}}$. Hence by Proposition 7.10.d $M_{\gamma_\varepsilon} \prec^+ M_{\gamma_{\varepsilon+1}}$. ⊣

Claim 9.10. *The sequence $\langle M_{\gamma_\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < cf(\delta)\rangle^\frown\langle M_\delta\rangle$ is continuous.*

Proof. Take $\delta' \in \{\gamma_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \mathrm{cf}(\delta)\} \bigcup \{\delta\}$ and take $x \in M_{\delta'}$. We have to find $\varepsilon < cf(\delta)$ such that $\gamma_\varepsilon < \delta'$ and $x \in M_{\gamma_\varepsilon}$. By clause 2 the sequence $\langle M_\beta : \beta < \lambda^{+2}\rangle$ is continuous, so for some $\beta < \delta'$ $x \in M_\beta$. The ordinals sequence $\langle \gamma_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < cf(\delta)\rangle^\frown\langle\delta\rangle$ is increasing and continuous. Hence for some $\varepsilon < cf(\delta)$ with $\beta < \gamma_\varepsilon < \delta'$. Since $M_\beta \subseteq M_{\gamma_\varepsilon}$, $x \in M_{\gamma_\varepsilon}$. ⊣

Claim 9.11. *$M_{\gamma_\varepsilon} \preceq^{NF} M_\delta$ for each $\varepsilon < \mathrm{cf}(\delta)$.*

Proof. By Proposition 6.5.d (and Claim 9.9, Claim 9.10 and Proposition 7.10.a). ⊣

Now we return to the proof of $(*)_\delta$. Fix $\alpha < \delta$.

Claim 9.12. *$M_{\alpha+1} \preceq^{NF} M_{\gamma_{\varepsilon+1}}$ for some $\varepsilon < cf(\delta)$.*

Proof. Take $\varepsilon < cf(\delta)$ with $\alpha + 1 < \gamma_{\varepsilon+1}$. $\gamma_{\varepsilon+1} = \zeta + 1$ for some ζ. So by $(*)_\zeta.1$ $M_{\alpha+1} \preceq^{NF} M_{\zeta+1} = M_{\gamma_{\varepsilon+1}}$. $\dashv$

Case a: $\delta \notin S$. In this case by clause 4 $M_\delta \prec^{+} M_{\delta+1}$. So by Proposition 7.10.c it is enough to prove that $M_{\alpha+1} \preceq^{NF} M_\delta$. By Claim 9.12 $M_{\alpha+1} \preceq^{NF} M_{\gamma_{\varepsilon+1}}$ for some ε. By Claim 9.11 $M_{\gamma_{\varepsilon+1}} \preceq^{NF} M_\delta$. So by Proposition 6.5.b $M_{\alpha+1} \preceq^{NF} M_\delta$.

Case b: $\delta \in S$. In this case we have to prove that $M_{\alpha+1} \preceq^{NF} M_{\delta+1}$. We choose f_α by induction on $\alpha \leq \lambda^+$ such that:

1. For every $\alpha \leq \lambda^+$, $f_\alpha : M^*_\alpha \to M_{\gamma_\alpha}$ is an isomorphism.
2. $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha \leq \lambda^+ \rangle$ is an increasing continuous sequence of isomorphisms.

There is no problem to carry out this induction [Why? We can choose f_0 by Theorem 1.33, (the uniqueness of the saturated model in λ^+ over λ). $M^*_\alpha \prec^{+} M^*_{\alpha+1}$. By Claim 9.8 $M_{\gamma_\alpha} \prec^{+} M_{\gamma_{\alpha+1}}$. So by Theorem 7.13.a, for every α, we can find $f_{\alpha+1}$. For α limit take union].

Now by clause 4, $(M_\delta, M_{\delta+1}) \cong (M^*_{\lambda^+}, M^*_{\lambda^++1})$. So we can find an isomorphism $f : M_{\lambda^++1} \to M_{\delta+1}$ that extends f_{λ^+}. For every $\varepsilon < \lambda^+$ $M^*_\varepsilon \preceq^{NF} M^*_{\lambda^++1}$, so $M_{\gamma_\varepsilon} = f[M^*_\varepsilon] \preceq^{NF} f[M^*_{\lambda^++1}] = M_{\delta+1}$. So $M_{\gamma_\varepsilon} \preceq M_{\delta+1}$ for each $\varepsilon < cf(\delta)$. Hence $M_{\gamma_{\varepsilon+1}} \preceq^{NF} M_{\delta+1}$ for each $\varepsilon < cf(\delta)$. But by Claim 9.12 for some $\varepsilon < cf(\delta)$ $M_{\alpha+1} \preceq^{NF} M_{\gamma_{\varepsilon+1}}$. Therefore by Proposition 6.5.b $M_{\alpha+1} \preceq^{NF} M_{\delta+1}$. $\dashv$

$\dashv$

Theorem 9.13. *The following conditions are equivalent:*

(a) $(K^{sat}, \preceq^{NF} \restriction K^{sat})$ *does not satisfy smoothness.*
(b) There are $M^*_1, M^*_2 \in K^{sat}$ *such that* $M^*_1 \preceq^{\otimes} M^*_2$ *but* $M^*_1 \not\preceq^{NF} M^*_2$.
(c) There is a sequence $\langle M_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \leq \lambda^+ + 1 \rangle$ *of models in* K^{sat} *such that for each* ε, ζ *with* $\varepsilon < \zeta \leq \lambda^+ + 1$ *we have* $\varepsilon \neq \lambda^+ \Leftrightarrow M_\varepsilon \prec^{+} M_\zeta \Leftrightarrow M_\varepsilon \preceq^{NF} M_\zeta$.

Proof. $c \Rightarrow a$ is clear. $b \Rightarrow c$ holds by Proposition 8.6. $a \Rightarrow b$ holds by Proposition 8.3.b. $\dashv$

Now we can prove Theorem 7.3, but first we remind it: If $(K^{sat}, \preceq^{NF} \restriction K^{sat})$ does not satisfy smoothness, then there are $2^{\lambda^{+2}}$ pairwise non-isomorphic models in $K_{\lambda^{+2}}$.

Proof. Condition a of Theorem 9.13 is satisfied, so condition c is satisfied too. Hence by Theorem 9.7 we have the conclusion of the theorem. $\dashv$

10. A GOOD λ^+-FRAME

Discussion: In Definitions 2.18, 2.20 and 2.22 we expanded the definition of the non-forking relation and basic types to models in $K_{>\lambda}$. In Theorem 2.26 we proved some axioms of a good frame for this expansions. Here we are going to prove the other axioms. So why are sections 3-9 needed? In other words, what are the difficulties in proving that S^+ (defined below) is a good λ^+-frame? The main problem is that amalgamation may not hold in $(K_{\lambda^+}, \preceq\restriction K_{\lambda^+})$. Now we can overcome this problem by restricting the relation $\preceq_{K_{\lambda^+}}$ to the relation $\preceq^{NF}$. But then there is a problem with smoothness. We overcome this problem by showing that non-smoothness is a non-structure property, see section 9. For the non-structure theorem, we had to restrict to the class of saturated models in λ^+ over λ. Now the relation $\prec^+$ and the locality enable use to prove the remaining axioms.

Definition 10.1. Let $\mathfrak{s}$ be a semi good frame. We say that $\mathfrak{s}$ is *successful* when:

(1) $\mathfrak{s}$ is *weakly successful* (i.e. we have existence for $K^{3,uq}_{\mathfrak{s}}$).
(2) $(K^{sat}, \preceq^{NF}\restriction K^{sat})$ satisfies smoothness.

Hypothesis 10.2. $\mathfrak{s}$ is a successful semi-good λ-frame with conjugation.

We remind that the types in this paper are classes of triples under some equivalence relation. But this relation depends on the partial order, we define on the class of models. For $M_0, M_1 \in K_{\lambda^+}$ when we write $tp(a, M, N)$ we mean to the partial order $\preceq$. But when we want to consider the partial order $\preceq^{NF}$ we have to write it explicitly.

Definition 10.3. For $M_0, M_1 \in K^{sat}$ and $a \in M_1 - M_0$ we define

$$tp^+(a, M_0, M_1) := tp_{((K^{sat})^{up},(\preceq^{NF}\restriction K^{sat})^{up})}(a, M_0, M_1).$$

(About '*sat*' see Definition 7.2 (page 54) and about '*up*' see Definition 1.13 (page 5)).

Proposition 10.4. *For every M_0, M_1, M_2 with $M_0 \preceq^{NF} M_1 \wedge M_0 \preceq^{NF} M_2$ and every a_1, a_2 with $a \in M_1 - M_0 \wedge a_2 \in M_2 - M_0$:*

$$tp^+(a_1, M_0, M_1) = tp^+(a_2, M_0, M_2) \Leftrightarrow tp(a_1, M_0, M_1) = tp(a_2, M_0, M_2).$$

Proof. The first direction: Suppose $tp^+(a_1, M_0, M_1) = tp^+(a_2, M_0, M_2)$. By Theorem 7.18.c (page 65) $(K^{sat}, \preceq^{NF}\restriction K^{sat})$ has amalgamation. So there are f_1, f_2, M_3 such that: $M_0 \preceq^{NF} M_3$, $f_n : M_n \to M_3$ is a $\preceq^{NF}$-embedding over M_0 and $f_1(a_1) = f_2(a_2)$. But $K^{sat} \subseteq K$, and the relation $\preceq^{NF}$ is included in the relation $\preceq$ so the amalgamation (f_1, f_2, M_3) witnesses that $tp(a_1, M_0, M_1) = tp(a_2, M_0, M_2)$.

The second direction: Suppose $tp(a_1, M_0, M_1) = tp(a_2, M_0, M_2)$. Take an amalgamation (f_1, f_2, M_3) of M_1, M_2 over M_0 with $f_1(a_1) = f_2(a_2)$. For each $N \in K_\lambda$ with $N \preceq M_0$ $tp(f_1(a_1), N, f_1[M_1]) = tp(f_2(a_2), N, f_2[M_2])$. So by Theorem 7.13.b $tp^+(a_1, M_0, M_1) = tp^+(a_2, M_0, M_2)$. ⊣

Although we defined restriction of types in Definition 1.21.3 (on page 7), the following definition is needed:

Definition 10.5. For $p = tp^+(a, M_0, M_1)$ and $N \in K_\lambda$ with $N \preceq M_0$ we define $p \restriction N := tp(a, N, M_1)$.

The following definition is based on Definition 2.18 (page 18).

Definition 10.6. $\mathfrak{s}^+ := ((K^{sat})^{up}, (\preceq^{NF}\restriction K^{sat})^{up}, \mathfrak{s}^{bs,+}, \overset{+}{\bigcup\!\!\!\!\bigcup})$, where:

1. For each $M \in K^{sat}$ we define $S^{bs,+}(M) := \{tp^+(a,M,N) : \{M,N\} \subseteq K^{sat},\ M \preceq^{NF} N,\ tp(a,M,N) \in S^{bs}_{>\lambda}\}$
2. $\overset{+}{\bigcup\!\!\!\!\bigcup}$ is defined by: $tp^+(a,M_1,M_2)$ does not fork over M_0 if $\{M_0,M_1,M_2\} \subseteq K^{sat},\ M_0 \preceq^{NF} M_1 \preceq^{NF} M_2$ and $tp(a,M_1,M_2)$ does not fork over M_0.

Proposition 10.7.

(a) S^{bs} is well defined: It does not depend on the triple (M_0,M_1,a) that represents the type.

(b) $\overset{+}{\bigcup\!\!\!\!\bigcup}$ is well defined: It does not depend on the triple (M_0,M_1,a) that represents the type.

Proof. By Proposition 10.4. $\dashv$

Proposition 10.8. *Let $\mathfrak{s}$ be a successful semi-good λ-frame with conjugation.*

(1) $(K^{sat}, \preceq^{NF}\restriction K^{sat})$ satisfies axiom c of a.e.c. in λ^+ (i.e. Definition 1.1.2.c).

(2) $(K^{sat}, \preceq^{NF}\restriction K^{sat})$ is an a.e.c. in λ^+.

(3) $(K^{sat}, \preceq^{NF}\restriction K^{sat})$ satisfies the amalgamation property.

Proof. By Theorem 7.18 and hypothesis 10.2. $\dashv$

Theorem 10.9. *Let $\mathfrak{s}$ be a successful semi-good λ-frame with conjugation. Then $\mathfrak{s}^+$ is a good λ^+-frame.*

Proof. By Proposition 10.8 $(K^{sat}, \preceq^{NF}\restriction K^{sat})$ is an a.e.c. in λ^+ with amalgamation. So by Fact 1.15 (page 5) $((K^{sat})^{up}, (\preceq^{NF}\restriction K^{sat})^{up})$ is an a.e.c. with LST number λ^+. By Theorem 1.33 (page 9) K^{sat} is categorical. So $(K^{sat}, \preceq^{NF}\restriction K^{sat})$ has joint embedding. By Proposition 7.12.a (page 58) and Proposition 7.10.a there is no $\preceq^{NF}$-maximal model in K^{sat}. What about the axioms of the basic types and the non-forking relation? By Theorem 2.26 the following axioms are satisfied: Density, monotonicity, local character and continuity.

Proposition 10.10. *$\mathfrak{s}^+$ satisfies basic stability.*

Proof. Let $M \in K^{sat}$. $M \in K_{\lambda^+}$, so it has a representation $\langle N_\alpha : \alpha \in \lambda^+\rangle$. For $p \in S^{bs,+}(M)$ define (α_p, q_p) by: α_p is the minimal ordinal in λ^+ such that p does not fork over N_α. $q_p =: p \restriction N_{\alpha_p}$. For every $\alpha \in \lambda^+$ we have $|S^{bs}(N_\alpha)| \leq \lambda^+$, so $|(\alpha_p,q_p) : p \in S^{bs,+}(M)| \leq \lambda^+ \times \lambda^+ = \lambda^+$. So it is sufficient to prove that the function $p \to (\alpha_p, q_p)$ is an injection. For every $p_1, p_2 \in S^{bs,+}(M)$ if $\alpha_{p_1} = \alpha_{p_2} \wedge q_{p_1} = q_{p_2}$ Then by Corollary 7.17.b (locality, page 65) $p_1 = p_2$. $\dashv$

Proposition 10.11.

(1) If

(a) $N \in K_\lambda$ and $M \in K_{\lambda^+}$.

(b) For $n = 1, 2$ $p_n \in S^{bs,+}(M)$ and does not fork over N.

(c) $p_1 \restriction N = p_2 \restriction N$.

Then $p_1 = p_2$.

(2) $\mathfrak{s}^+$ satisfies uniqueness.

Proof.
1) By the proof of Corollary 7.17.b (locality, page 65). Remember that if $N_0 \preceq^{NF} N_1 \prec^+ N_2$ then $N_0 \preceq N_2$ (By Proposition 7.10.c) .
2) Suppose $n < 2 \Rightarrow M_n \in K^{sat}$, $M_0 \preceq M_1$, $p, q \in S^{bs,+}(M_1)$, $p \restriction M_0 = q \restriction M_0$ and p, q does not fork over M_0. By the definition of $\overset{+}{\bigcup}$, there are $N_p, N_q \in K_\lambda$, such that $N_p \preceq M_0$, $N_q \preceq M_0$, p does not fork over N_p and q does not fork over N_q. As $LST(K, \preceq) \leq \lambda$, there is a model $N \in K_\lambda$ with $N_p \bigcup N_q \subseteq N \preceq M_0$. By axiom 1.1.1.e $N_p \preceq N$ and $N_q \preceq N$. By Theorem 2.26(2) (monotonicity, page 19), p, q does not fork over N. By the assumption $p \restriction M_0 = q \restriction M_0$, so $p \restriction N = q \restriction N$. Hence by item 1, $p = q$. $\dashv$

Proposition 10.12. *$\mathfrak{s}^+$ satisfies symmetry.*

Proof.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & M_2 \arrow[rrr, "id"] & & & M_4 \\
 & & & M_3 \arrow[ur, "id"] & \\
M_0 \arrow[uur, "id"] \arrow[rr, "id"] & & M_1 \arrow[ur, "id"] & & \\
 & N_2 \arrow[uuu, "id"] \arrow[ur, "id"] \arrow[rrr, "id"] & & & N_4 \arrow[uuu, "id"] \\
 & & & N_3 \arrow[uuu, "id"] \arrow[ur, "id"] & \\
N_0 \arrow[uuu, "id"] \arrow[uur, "id"] \arrow[rr, "id"] & & N_1 \arrow[uuu, "id"] \arrow[ur, "id"] & &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Suppose 1-5 where:
(1) $\{M_0, M_1, M_3\} \subseteq K^{sat}$.
(2) $M_0 \preceq^{NF} M_1 \preceq^{NF} M_3$.
(3) $tp(a_1, M_0, M_3) \in S^{bs,+}(M_0)$.

(4) $a_1 \in M_1$.
(5) $tp(a_2, M_1, M_3)$ does not fork over M_0.

Step a: We choose models $N_0, N_1, N_3 \in K_\lambda$ which satisfies 6-12 where:
(6) $n \in \{0, 1, 3\} \Rightarrow N_n \preceq M_n$ and $N_0 \preceq N_1 \preceq N_3$.
(7) $tp(a_2, M_1, M_3)$ does not fork over N_0.
(8) $tp(a_1, M_0, M_3)$ does not fork over N_0.
(9) $a_1 \in N_1$.
(10) $a_2 \in N_3$.
(11) $\widehat{NF}(N_0, N_1, M_0, M_1)$.
(12) $\widehat{NF}(N_1, N_3, M_1, M_3)$.
(Why is it possible? By 2, there are representations $\langle N_{0,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$, $\langle N_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$, $\langle N^*_{1,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$, $\langle N_{3,\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ of M_0, M_1, M_1, M_3 respectively, such that: $\alpha < \lambda^+ \Rightarrow NF(N_{0,\alpha}, N_{1,\alpha}, N_{0,\alpha+1}, N_{1,\alpha+1})$, $NF(N^*_{1,\alpha}, N_{3,\alpha}, N^*_{1,\alpha+1}, N_{3,\alpha+1})$. Let E be a club of λ^+ such that $\alpha \in E \Rightarrow N_{1,\alpha} = \mathcal{N}^*_{1,\alpha}$. Choose $\alpha \in E$ big enough such that 7,8,9,10 will satisfied for $N_0 = N_{0,\alpha}$ $N_1 = N_{1,\alpha},\ N_3 = N_{3,\alpha})$

Step b: [We use the symmetry axiom] By 6,8 we have:
(13) $tp(a_1, N_0, N_3) \in S^{bs}(N_0)$.
by 6,7 we have:
(14) $tp(a_2, N_1, N_3)$ does not fork over N_0.
Now by Definition 2.1.3.e (symmetry) there are $N^*_2, N^*_4 \in K_\lambda$ which satisfies 15-18:
(15) $N_0 \preceq N^*_2 \preceq N^*_4$.
(16) $N_3 \preceq N^*_4$.
(17) $a_2 \in N^*_2$.
(18) $tp(a_1, N^*_2, N^*_4)$ does not fork over N_0.

Step c: [Move everything to K^{sat}]
We can choose f which satisfies 19,20:
(19) f is an injection, $dom(f) = N^*_4$ and $f \restriction N_3$ is the identity.
(20) $f[N^*_4] \bigcap M_3 = N_3$.
Define $N_4 := f[N^*_4],\ N_2 := f[N^*_2]$. By the existence proposition of the $\prec^+$-extensions (Proposition 7.12.c), there is $M_4 \in K_\lambda$ which satisfies 21,22:
(21) $\widehat{NF}(N_3, N_4, M_3, M_4)$.
(22) $M_3 \prec^+ M_4$.
By 20 (mainly) we know:
(23) $N_2 \bigcap M_0 = N_0$.
(Why? By 15 and the definitions of f, N_2, we have $N_0 \preceq N_2$. By 6 $N_0 \preceq M_0$. Let $x \in N_2 \bigcap M_0$. By 2,15 $x \in N_4 \bigcap M_3$. So by 20 $x \in N_3$. So $x \in N_3 \bigcap M_1$. Hence by 12, $x \in N_1$. So $x \in N_1 \bigcap M_0$. Hence by 11, we have $x \in N_0$). So by the existence proposition of $\widehat{NF}$ (Proposition 6.3.c), there is $M_2 \in K^{sat}$ such that:

(24) $\widehat{NF}(N_0, N_2, M_0, M_2)$.
Without loss of generality $N_4 \bigcap M_2 = N_2$ as $M_0 \bigcap N_4 = N_0$. By Proposition 7.12.b there is $M_6 \in K^{sat}$ which satisfies 25,26:
(25) $M_2 \prec^+ M_6$.
(26) $\widehat{NF}(N_2, N_4, M_2, M_6)$.

Step d: We will prove 27,28:
(27) $tp(a_1, M_2, M_6)$ does not fork over N_0.
(28) There is an isomorphism $g : M_6 \to M_4$ over $M_0 \bigcup N_2$.
Then we will conclude:
(29) $tp(a_1, g[M_2], M_4)$ does not fork over M_0. By 25, Proposition 7.12.c=7.10 and 24 we have 30:
(30) $M_0 \prec^+ M_6$.
By 24,25 and Theorem 6.3.b (monotonicity, on page 50): (31) $NF(N_0, N_2, M_0, M_6)$.
By 24,26,28 and the transitivity of the relation $\widehat{NF}$ we have:
(32)$NF(N_0, N_2, M_0, M_4)$.
By 2,22 and Proposition 7.10.c:
(33) $M_0 \prec^+ M_4$.

By 30-33 and Theorem 7.13.c, we know 28. By 26, and Theorem 6.3.e (respecting the frame, page 50):
(34) $tp(a_1, M_2, M_6)$ does not fork over N_2. By 18 (and 12,9,19):
(35) $tp(a_1, N_2, N_4)$ does not fork over N_0. By 26 $N_4 \preceq M_6$, so by Theorem 2.26(3) (the transitivity of the non-forking relation), we have:
(27) $tp(a_1, M_2, M_6)$ does not fork over N_0.

Step e:
It remains to prove
(36) $a_2 \in g[M_2]$. By 28 , g is an isomorphism over N_2, so it is sufficient to prove $a_2 \in N_2$. By 17 $a_2 \in N_2^*$. So by 10,19 $a_2 \in N_2$.

$\dashv$

By the following proposition, $\mathfrak{s}^+$ satisfies extension.

Proposition 10.13.

1. *If $N \preceq M \in K^{sat}$, $p \in S^{bs}(N)$, $N \in K_\lambda$, then there is $q \in S^{bs,+}(M)$ such that $q \restriction N = p$ and q does not fork over N.*
2. *If $\{M_0, M_1\} \subseteq K^{sat}$, $M_0 \preceq^{NF} M_1$, $p \in S^{bs,+}(M_0)$ than there is an extension of p to $S^{bs,+}(M_1)$.*

Proof.

1. Let a, N_1 be such that $tp(a, N, N_1) = p$. By Theorem 6.3.c (page 50) without loss of generality there is a model M_1 such that $\widehat{NF}(N, N_1, M, M_1)$. By Theorem 6.3.e $q := tp(a, M, M_1)$ does not fork over N.
2. By the definition of $S^{bs,+}$, there is a model $N \in K_\lambda$ such that $N \preceq M_0$ and p does not fork over N. By item (1), there is $q \in S^{bs,+}(M_1)$ which does not fork over N, and $q \restriction N = p \restriction N$. q does not fork

over M_0 as it does not fork over N. So it is sufficient to prove that $q_0 := q \restriction M_0 = p$. By Theorem 2.26.2 (monotonicity), q_0 does not fork over N. $q_0 \restriction N = q \restriction N = p \restriction N$. Hence by Corollary 7.17.b (locality) $p = q_0$.

$\dashv$

This ends the proof of Theorem 10.9. $\dashv$

11. Conclusions

Theorem 11.1. *Suppose:*

1. $\mathfrak{s} = (K, \preceq, S^{bs}, \bigcup)$ *is a semi-good* λ*-frame with conjugation.*
2. $I(\lambda^{+2}, K) < \mu_{unif}(\lambda^{+2}, 2^{\lambda^+})$.
3. $2^{\lambda} < 2^{\lambda^+} < 2^{\lambda^{+2}}$, *and* $WdmId(\lambda^+)$ *is not saturated in* λ^{+2}.

Then

1. *There is a good* λ^+*-frame* $\mathfrak{s}^+ = ((K^{sat}, \preceq^{NF} \restriction K^{sat})^{up}, S^{bs,+}, \overset{+}{\bigcup})$, *such that* $K^{sat} \subseteq K_{\lambda^+}$ *and the relation* $\preceq^{NF} \restriction K^{sat}$ *is included in the relation* $\preceq \restriction K^{sat}$.
2. $\mathfrak{s}^+$ *has the conjugation property.*
3. *There is a model in* K *of cardinality* λ^{+2}.
4. *There is a model in* K *of cardinality* λ^{+3}.

Proof. (1) By Corollary 4.23 (page 37) $\mathfrak{s}$ is weakly successful in the density sense. $\mathfrak{s}$ has conjugation, so by Proposition 4.7 (page 31), $\mathfrak{s}$ is weakly successful. By clause 2 of our assumption, $I(\lambda^{+2}, K) < \mu_{unif}(\lambda^{+2}, 2^{\lambda^+})$. But by Proposition 4.15 $\mu_{unif}(\lambda^{+2}, 2^{\lambda^+}) \leq 2^{\lambda^{+2}}$. So $I(\lambda^{+2}, K) < 2^{\lambda^{+2}}$. Hence by Theorem 7.3 (page 54), $(K^{sat}, \preceq^{NF} \restriction K^{sat})$ satisfies smoothness, i.e. $\mathfrak{s}$ is successful (Definition 10.1). So Hypothesis 10.2 is satisfied. Therefore by Theorem 10.9, $\mathfrak{s}^+$ is a good λ^+-frame. Obviously $K^{sat} \subseteq K_{\lambda^+}$ and $\preceq^{NF}$ is included in the relation $\preceq \restriction K_{\lambda^+}$.

(2) Why does $\mathfrak{s}^+$ have conjugation? Suppose $M_0 \preceq^{NF} M_1$, $\{M_0, M_1\} \subseteq K^{sat}$ and $p \in S^{bs,+}(M_1)$ does not fork over M_0. By the definition of $\overset{+}{\bigcup}$, there is $N \in K_\lambda$ such that $N \preceq M_0$ and p does not fork over N.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
p \restriction M_0 & f(p \restriction M_0) = p \\
M_0 \arrow[r, "id", "f"'] & M_1 \\
N \arrow[u, "id"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

By Theorem 1.33.a (the uniqueness of the saturated model), there is an isomorphism $f : M_0 \to M_1$ over N. By Theorem 2.26(2) (monotonicity), $p \restriction M_0$ does not fork over N. So $f(p \restriction M_0)$ does not fork over N. But also p does not fork over N and $f(p \restriction M_0) \restriction N = (p \restriction M_0) \restriction N = p \restriction N$ [Why do we have the first equality? There are M_0^+, f^+, a such that $p \restriction M_0 = tp(a, M_0, M_0^+)$ and $f \subseteq f^+$, $dom(f^+) = M_0^+$. So $(p \restriction M_0) \restriction N = tp(a, N, M_0^+) = tp(f^+(a), N, f^+[M_0^+]) = tp(f^+(a), M_1, f^+[M_0^+]) \restriction N = f(p \restriction M_0) \restriction N$]. So by 10.11(1), $f(p \restriction M_0) = p$.

(3) By Proposition 3.4.3 (page 23).

(4) Substitute $\mathfrak{s}^+$ instead of $\mathfrak{s}$ in Proposition 3.4.3. ⊣

Corollary 11.2. *Suppose:*

(1) $n < \omega$.
(2) $\mathfrak{s} = (K, \preceq, S^{bs}, \bigcup\!\!\!\!\bigcup)$ *is a semi-good* λ*-frame with conjugation.*
(3) $m < n \Rightarrow I(\lambda^{+(2+m)}, K) < \mu_{unif}(\lambda^{+(2+m)}, 2^{\lambda^{+(1+m)}})$.
(4) For every $m < n$, $2^{\lambda} < 2^{\lambda^+} < 2^{\lambda^{+2}} < ...2^{\lambda^{+(1+n)}}$ *and* $WdmId(\lambda^{+1+m})$ *is not saturated in* $\lambda^{+(2+m)}$.

then *there is a good* λ^{+n}*-frame* $\mathfrak{s}^n =: ((K^n, \leq^n), S^{bs,+n}, \overset{+n}{\bigcup\!\!\!\!\bigcup})$, *such that:*

(1) $K^n_{\lambda^{+n}} \subseteq K_{\lambda^{+n}}$, $\leq^n \subseteq \preceq^k \restriction K^n$.
(2) $\mathfrak{s}^n$ *has conjugation.*
(3) There is a model in K^n *of cardinality* $\lambda^{+(2+n)}$.

Proof. By induction on n, using Theorem 11.1. ⊣

Corollary 11.3. *Suppose:*

(1) $\mathfrak{s} = (K, \preceq, S^{bs}, \bigcup\!\!\!\!\bigcup)$ *is a semi-good* λ*-frame with conjugation.*
(2) $m < \omega \Rightarrow I(\lambda^{+(2+m)}, K) < \mu_{unif}(\lambda^{+(2+m)}, 2^{\lambda^{+(1+m)}})$.
(3) $2^{\lambda^{+m}} < 2^{\lambda^{+m+1}}$ *and for every* $m < \omega$, $WdmId(\lambda^{+1+m})$ *is not saturated in* $\lambda^{+(2+m)}$.

Then *there is a model in* K^n *of cardinality* λ^{+n} *for every* $n < \omega$.

Proof. By Corollary 11.2. ⊣

12. Comparison to [Sh 600]

A reader who knows [Sh 600], might ask about the main problems in writing our paper. As in [Sh 600], there is a wide use of brimmed extensions (i.e. using stability), we had to find alternatives.

First the relation NF is defined in [Sh 600] using brimness, so we found a natural definition (maybe an easier one) which is equivalent to the definition in [Sh 600], but not using brimness.

Another problem was proving conjugation (see Definition 2.12, page 15). But in the main examples there is conjugation, so it is reasonable to assume conjugation.

Another problem was to find a relation $\prec^+$ on k^{nice} which satisfies the required properties (see the discussion before Definition 7.4, page 55). In [Sh 600] it uses essentially brimness. But as the needed relation is on models of cardinality λ^+, We can find such a relation, using just weak stability.

Acknowledgment. We thank Boaz Tsaban and Alon Sitton for their useful suggestions and comments. We thank the referee for doing an outstanding and extremely conscientious job in improving the paper, for his useful suggestions and for an example he pointed out.

References

[Ba:book] John T.Baldwin. Categoricity. A book in preparation. preprint available at `http://www.math.uic.edu/ jbaldwin/put/a.e.c.lec.pdf`

[Gr:book] Rami Grossberg. Classification of abstract elementary classes. A book in preparation.

[BKS] J.T. Baldwin, A. Kolesnikov and S. Shelah. The amalgamation spectrum. In preparation.

[Gr 21] Rami Grossberg. Classification theory for abstract elementary classes. Logic and Algebra, ed. Yi Zhang, Contemporary Mathematics, Vol 302, AMS, (2002), pp. 165–204.

[HS 89] complete...

[Sh:c] Saharon Shelah. Classification theory and the number of non-isomorphic models. A book. Amsterdam (1990).

[Sh:h] Saharon Shelah. Classification theorey for non-elementary classes. Studies in Logic: Mathematical logic and foundations. volume 18. Year 2009.

[Sh 88] Saharon Shelah. Classification of non-elementary classes, II. Abstract Elementary Classes. In **Classification Theory (Chicago IL 1985)**, volume 1292 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 419–497. Springer, Berlin, 1987. Proceedings of the USA-Israel Conference on Classification Theory, Chicago, December 1985; ed. Baldwin, J.T.

[Sh 88r] Saharon Shelah. Abstract elementary classes near $\aleph_1$ The first chapter of [Sh:h] Preprint available at `http://front.math.ucdavis.edu/0705.4137`.

[Sh 91] Saharon Shelah. complete...

[Sh 600] Saharon Shelah. Categoricity in abstract elementary classes: going up inductive step. It is one of the chapters of [Sh:h] Preprint available at `http://front.math.ucdavis.edu/0011.5215`.

[Sh 705] Saharon Shelah. Toward classification theory of good λ frames and abstract elementary classes It is one of the chapters of [Sh:h] Preprint available at `http://front.math.ucdavis.edu/0404.5272`.

[Sh 734] Saharon Shelah. On categorical A.E.C It is one of the chapters of [Sh:h] Preprint available at `http://front.math.ucdavis.edu/0808.3023`.

[Sh 838] Saharon Shelah. Non-structure in λ^{++} using instances of WGCH It is one of the chapters of [Sh:h] Preprint available at `http://front.math.ucdavis.edu/0808.3020`.

[Sh 849] Saharon Shelah. Weak forms of good frames In preparation.

[Sh E53] Saharon Shelah. The introduction to [Sh:h].

[JrSh 940] Adi Jarden and Saharon Shelah. Weakening the Local Character. Work in progress.

[JrSi 3] Adi Jarden and Alon Sitton. Independence of sets without stability. Submitted at JSL.

[Jr 6] Adi Jarden. non-forking frames without conjugation. Work in progress.

E-mail address, Adi Jarden: `jardenadi@gmail.com`

Department of Mathematics and computer science., Bar-Ilan University,
Ramatgan 52900, Israel

E-mail address, Saharon Shelah: `shelah@math.huji.ac.il`

Institute of Mathematics, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel, and Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ, U.S.A